

Opposition report

Thesis compiled by: Gustaf Lindstedt & Martin Runelöv

Title of thesis: Context modeling using a common sense database

Opponent: Martin Andersen

Was it easy to understand the underlying purpose of the project? Comments.

I think it was really easy to understand this. The authors has a section called problem statement where they specifically mention the purpose or goal of the project. They define 3 questions which will help them to achieve their goal, and these questions seems good and narrow enough. So the authors did a good job to make the reader understand what the purpose of the report or the project is.

Do you consider that the report title justly reflects the contents of the report?

The report title is "*Context modeling using a common sense database*" which I think fits the report perfectly. This is what the report is about so I can't think of what another title for it would be. So I think that the title justly reflects the contents of the report.

How did the author describe the project background? Was there an introduction and general survey of this area?

The background mainly consists of information regarding different chatbots, explanation of the term "common sense" and the term "common sense database" and information on ConceptNet. I felt that all the information to be able to understand the subject and the next sections of the report was written here. I didn't feel that anything was missing that should be included here or that anything that was here should be moved somewhere else. So the background was good described, the only thing that could be improved here was the references, but that can be read more about a little further down in this opposition.

To what degree did the author justify his/her choice of method of tackling the problem?

There is a part in the introduction where the authors describe how they aimed to approach their stated problems. I think this part could get it's own section called "method" or "approach", but what was written there was really good. The authors presents their approach, and they explain why it is suitable for their project, they mention that they excluded "*the construction of well structured and coherent sentences*" because it isn't the focus for this report and they mentioned that "*the relevance of the constructed context will be judged subjectively **since** they are not inherently measurable due to their abstract nature and complexity*". I think this indicates that they have tried to justify their choice of method really good.

Is the method adequately described?

I think so, it might be a little short and could be described in more detail, but I think that the

relevant things are mentioned here regarding the method. I couldn't find anything more that should have been brought up here, and their method really sounds appropriate for their project.

Has the author set out his/her results clearly and concisely?

Yes I do. The results are well-presented and easy to follow. The authors display their results in two graphs which gives a really good overview, and the reader can see the results really clear when viewing it as graphs. So I think that the authors have done a good job in writing and presenting their results.

Do you consider the author's conclusions to be credible?

I think that both the discussion and the conclusions of the report is credible. In the discussion, possible improvements to the project are brought up and I think that these improvements make much sense, based on what I know about the subject. Furthermore, the conclusion really ends the report well, and what is brought up here is credible and well-written.

What is your opinion of the bibliography? What types of literature are included? Do you feel they are relevant?

I think that the list of sources is quite long and that some of the sources aren't very relevant for the subject. For example, the authors might benefit from just explaining what the "loebner prize" is in a short sentence instead of including it in the bibliography. So though many of the sources of course are really good and relevant, some of them could be excluded in my opinion. Also, the sources could be ordered either after when they are referenced to in the report or by alphabetical order. But other than that, I think that many of the sources are really good, and they look correctly written.

The types of literature is a mix of internet pages, scientific research and articles, which I feel is a good mix according to the project.

Other comments on the report and its structure.

Really good structure, it's easy to grasp and to get an overview of the content in the report by looking at the name of the different sections. So the structure of the report was one of the stronger things and can be read about more below.

What are the stronger features of the work/report?

I think that the language in the report is one of the strongest features, the english is excellent, the tempus in the different sections is correct and the text is formal and technical but still quite easy to grasp and understand.

Furthermore, I think that the structure and the "design" of the report is really nice. It looks good, it

feels like everything is where it should be, the amount of sections is just right and there is a clear thread through the report.

What are the weaker features of the work/report?

I think that the references could be improved, there are some things that are unclear about them. For example, it isn't entirely clear where some of the information comes from at some places and at one section in the background (section 2.1.1 - the two last parts) the authors haven't referenced to any source, at least what I can see. So I think that some improvements on the references as well as the bibliography could be done.

Otherwise, the report overall is really good, but there are some sentences that could be changed and just some other small fixes.

What is your estimation of the news value of the work?

As the aim of the report isn't to come up with some groundbreaking new ideas and news, the news value isn't very high in a society point of perspective. But this wasn't what the authors intended either, so as long as the aim for the report is fulfilled, the report serves its purpose.

Summarize the work in a few lines.

A really interesting and well-written report with good language, structure and design. The references could be improved, along with the bibliography as well, but other than that I think that the report is very good.

Questions to author:

1. If you had more time for this project, is there anything more you would have added or done different in your implementation to make it better?
2. Are you happy with the results of your implementation? Did you expect to get those results?
3. Did you think about using another "common sense database" instead of ConceptNet for your implementation? Why did you choose ConceptNet?