

Chatterbot with common sense, Max Malmgren and Ulf Åhammar

Review by Erik Odenman

Introduction

The introduction is well structured. The background information feels relevant and makes the reader want to find out more on the subject. The purpose of the thesis follows and is clear and concise.

Structure and line of argument

Following the introduction comes sections containing extended background, object satisfiability as well as design and implementation. This structure seems reasonable as some new information is provided in each section and main concepts are explained in more detail. Section 4, Design and Implementation, becomes a bit heavy though and could have some content moved to other sections. Some of the information about ELIZA, OMCS and ConceptNet could for example be moved to section 2, and section 4.5 contains some results which could be presented later instead. The last part of 4.5 describing a bug fix also feels a bit out of place and could be removed.

Results and conclusions

The conversation logs are interesting and fun to read. It also feels like appropriate conclusions are drawn based on these, as it is obvious that the responses generated by the Baseline version are more sound even though it would not have been able to make the connection between 'car' and 'motor vehicle'. Something that feels missing is a comparison or mention of other related projects (that is other projects involving the usage of a common knowledge database to aid a chatbot), as I would imagine there are plenty.

Language

For the most part the language is grammatically correct and of a good level of formality, although some less formal words and “swenglish” occurs in some sections. In section 4.5 some confusion arises regarding usage of the words “implementation” and “version” in the same context. It becomes unclear whether two different programs are made in parallel or if two versions of the same program are described. Metatext is used in the beginning of some sections, which is good and helps the reader navigate as well as getting a grip of the context.

All in all the paper is definitely readable and makes for a good introduction to the subject as well as encouraging further studies.