



**KTH Computer Science  
and Communication**

Kerstin Frenckner, tel 08-790 9754, e-mail: kfrenck@csc.kth.se2

February 12, 2009

Copyright CSC, KTH

## OPPOSITION FOR MASTER'S PROJECT

The duties of an opponent are to:

- Critically review the report in question
- Pay particular attention to the problem approach, the methodology chosen and to the interpretation/evaluation of results
- Make annotations on the report of clerical errors, other minor errors, incomprehensible or ambiguous text
- Complete this Opponent Record (use a computer or black ink)
- In advance – at the time stipulated – give this record to the persons stipulated in the instructions for your exjobb subject.
- Orally present your general opinion of and comments on the work during about 5 minutes after the author's presentation of the work
- Put questions to the author of the report following his/her presentation: you may put forward the questions set down in the Opponent Record, or some of these questions, but it is also reasonable to expect the presentation to generate new questions.
- Give the Opponent Record and the annotated report to the author at the conclusion of the seminar

You may contact the person responsible for the degree project, e.g. to test programs.

The Opponent Record can be completed either using a computer or manually. If writing by hand, use red or black ink and write distinctly. The Record copies must be legible but not necessarily aesthetically pleasing.

Master's projects vary considerably. Consequently, at times not all of the questions will be relevant to the project you are opposing. It can be appropriate to rephrase the questions to fit the project. You may also introduce one or two additional questions.

Attempt to answer the questions in the Opponent Record in relative detail. Answers such as **Yes** and **Good** are insufficient.

# OPPONENT RECORD

**Thesis compiled by**

**Fredrik Bystam and Jonas Sköld**

**Title of thesis:**

**Datorassistans vid lyrikskrivande**

**Opponent:**

**Ulf Åhammar**

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

Yes, the purpose is stated in a clear and concise way in the “Problemformulering”-headline.

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

Yes, the report title gives a good indication of the contents of the thesis.

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

There is an explanation of the different concepts discussed in the report, I found that it was interesting and contained sufficient information.

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

The choice of programming language was justified, and seeing as the purpose of the thesis was investigating whether a program could be used for assisting in lyrics writing, I think it was well justified to try and make such a program. The way of measuring success using test persons was well chosen, it seemed like something the technology actually can be used for.

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

Yes, the requirements for a test to be considered a success are discussed before the results are presented.

**Is the method adequately described?**

Although the way a test subject grades the rhyme is not discussed at length, I think that seeing as what is considered a good rhyme is something subjective, this is fine. The rest of the method is thoroughly described.

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

The results are presented in an easy to understand way, using examples from the gathered data and describing the test subjects opinions of the rhyme.

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

The conclusions seem reasonable based on the presented results.

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

The literature is a mix of lecture notes, books and websites. I think most of them were interesting and all of them were relevant to the subject.

**Which sections of the report were difficult to understand?**

I think the report is generally easy to understand, however understanding the part about "n-grams" required a lot of reading the references for me.

**Other comments on the report and its structure.**

N/A

**What are the stronger features of the work/report?**

The subject, I think that it was highly interesting to read about. Also the general presentation is very good.

**What are the weaker features of the work/report?**

I think some parts were a bit short, I would have liked to see a bit more detail in some parts of the report. Because some of the rhymes used as examples did not include information regarding which training data they were based on. This was the case for the "free"-tests, I would have at least liked to see an example of the data the test subjects were able to choose from.

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

I think the news value of the results in the thesis is rather high, this is actually something I would like to use when coming up with rhymes.

**Summarize the work in a few lines.**

The thesis investigates the possibility of using a program to help when writing lyrics or poetry, by using it to suggest rhymes and words that fit into the sentence. They find that the results of the rhyme-helping part of the program is generally positive, however the way the program suggests other words needs more work to be useful.

**Questions to author:**

**1.**

How did the training data used for the third test look like, and was there differences in the resulting sentences depending on which text the test subject choose?

**2.**

What do you think of the possibilities for generating whole pieces of poetry and lyrics for songs, completely automatically?

**3.**

Do you think it could be viable to implement other features such as suggestions by syllables, in order to make for example limericks or haiku?