



OPPONENT RECORD

Thesis compiled by

Mattis Kancans Envall, mattiske@kth.se

Axel Lewenhaupt, axellew@kth.se

Title of thesis:

The Swype Input Method

Opponent:

Paolo Brolin, paolobr@kth.se

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

Yes, the concept of text input seems relevant in today's context of small devices with touch screen, as stated in section 1 and 1.1. It is made clear that a benchmark of the author's implementation of Swype, in terms of accuracy, is to be done and analysed. However it is not made clear why the chosen algorithm and/or input method was the only one considered and why it would be relevant compared to other Swype algorithms and/or input methods. Nor is it explained how/if the author's implementation of Swype correlates with other implementations of Swype.

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

Yes, it clearly states that it is the Swype input method that is subject to examination.

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

In section 1 the use of text input methods are described in the context of smart phones as an introduction to the subject, furthermore some alternative methods are mentioned such as voice input and autocorrect.

A historic summary of text input methods and paradigms, in order to understand the development of these, are missing. A clarification of the definition of text input methodologies, and their uses would have been desirable for a better understanding of the subject's domain.

The general concept of the Swype input method is made clear in text and figure, but there is also a lack of references to industry standards or particular used Swype implementations.

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

In section 3 the Swype implementation method is well defined and decomposed into relevant parts, such as curve, turning point, Trie algorithm and optimizations. These parts are well explained but not weighted against other possible solutions or implementations of Swype, which makes it difficult for the uninitiated reader to validate them.

Did the author discuss the extent to which the prerequisites for the application of such a method are fulfilled?

Yes, the prerequisites are well defined in section 2 from both theoretical and technical point of view.

Is the method adequately described?

The Swype implementation method is defined and decomposed into relevant parts in section 3 in a way that makes it easy to grasp. The test methodology (input data, test group, metrics etc.) however is not discussed at all.

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

Yes, the use of tables and staple charts make it easy to understand the test results for the different test cases.

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

The conclusion is that the implemented algorithm produces good test results, however it is not clear in comparison to what.

With regard to the specific implementation possible improvements and sources of error are discussed, which increases the credibility. Discussion about the implementation's performance in terms of memory usage and speed are included but not connected to the initial purpose.

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

The bibliography includes important sources to back-up the claims and definitions done in the report. It mainly consists of information gathered from web pages.

Other comments on the report and its structure.

Well written, using comprehensible language with good composition of the different sections.

What are the stronger features of the work/report?

It provides an in depth understanding of how Swype text input could be implemented and wherein the challenges lies. Extensive research in different means to improve the implementation.

What are the weaker features of the work/report?

Lack of validation of the implemented algorithm, in comparison to other implementations of Swype used in the field of text input.

Lack of discussion about how linguistic aspects and human interaction affects test results in particular and Swype method in general.

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

Moderate to high, depending on the extent of other research in the area of text input methodologies for mobile devices.

Summarize the work in a few lines.

Over-all well-written and substantiated report on a particular implementation of Swype text input technology, how different optimizations affects its performance and potential areas of improvements.