OPPONENT RECORD

Thesis compiled by:

> **Richard Nysäter, Tobias Reinhammar**

Title of thesis:

> **Song Similarity Classification**

Opponent:

> **Philip Eliasson**

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

Yes, the problem of classifying music described in the introduction section of the report makes it clear both what the problem is and what the purpose of the project is.

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

The first part of the report after the background describes the terminology used and the result of similar work. After this the problem statement is declared. The project background is thoroughly explained which makes the problem statement clear. While the problem statement is clear the format of the introduction is in reverse order. The problem statement is heavily dependent on the background information to the point of becoming specific to the datasets and methods earlier explained. Instead the problem statement should be declared before the project specific information and later when the approach is discussed the available resources and tools should be explained.

The section about the earlier work is well written and very informative, although the terminology section of the report is already passed at this point there are still a few terms that are used that have not been defined.

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

The method of evaluating the results from the experiments is never explicitly justified but by the simplicity of the method it does not need justification. The method of measuring similarity is described shortly but never justified, however in this case why the method work is not apparent/trivial and need justification.

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

Implicitly, yes. All relevant aspects of how the similarity between two songs are perceived are discussed, and by so implying the prerequisites for the method.

Is the method adequately described?

The method of measuring similarity between songs is only shortly described and does not cover the complete algorithm at all. Also, the part of the algorithm that was explained is extremely hard to understand.

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

No. According to the problem statement the goal was to investigate the possibility of using a song dataset to **create an algorithm able to classify the similarity between songs** in the pop and rock genres with reasonable accuracy. At no point was an algorithm detailed or described dedicated for this purpose.

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

The conclusion regarding the experiments is consistent with the results. It is also stated that the algorithm was created in this study, which is never shown.

Which sections of the report were difficult to understand?

The hardest part to understand was the algorithm used to measure similarity and the graphs used to illustrate the results from the experiments. The discussion about the results was generally good but the word "song" was used for all different sets of songs used, causing some confusion.

Other comments on the report and its structure.

The structure was generally good with the exception of the problem statement being too dependent on the background information.

What are the stronger features of the work/report?
- Well written with good language
- Good structure
- Data used for testing is well described, making the reader aware of the uncertainty of the experiments
- Limitations and scope of the project is well defined
- The experiments are very well performed and discussed

What are the weaker features of the work/report?
- The report does not follow the problem statement
- The algorithm used to measure similarity between songs is never described

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

Considering the earlier work done in the field of measuring the similarity between songs there is no news value.

Summarize the work in a few lines.

My general opinion of the report is that it is well written and result in interesting conclusions. I feel that the biggest problem is that the report does not follow the problem statement and this is a serious flaw that greatly affects the results. If the problem statement could be changed to reflect the actual work done this would be a solid report with very well explained background, experiments and discussion.