OPPONENT RECORD

Thesis compiled by   Erik Odenamn

Title of thesis: A simple approach to the route following problem based
on the identification and localization of landmarks

Opponent: Andrew Saka

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

Yes it was easy to understand the underlying purpose in the project; he clearly describes background
and scope of the project in sections 1.1 and 1.2.

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

Yes, the report tittle is accurate.

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

There's a brief introduction where the author describes other researchers who have worked on similar
projects and a general survey is also provided on sub-problems that need to be assessed.

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

He justified it by stating that the solution to the problem had several big components to be assessed for
a good solution, and that other researchers have decided to put more on emphasis on other components
more than the other i.e. translation of natural language and creation of spatial semantic.

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

He did in section 1.2 where he properly describes the purpose and extent of the method and also in
section 2.2 where he bounds the method to be viable under certain constraints.

Is the method adequately described?

I think the method is properly described in the introductory text and in the pseudo code of the
algorithms attached in section 3.3.

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

Yes, he has presented data tables, diagrams and description of his results.

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

The author results are credible as he clearly stipulates his conclusions on the basis of his report, and he also denotes how to further improve the results for future intended work.

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

The bibliography was good but the links in references [4] and [6] we're missing.
Most of it literature was based on previous academic reports in the problem domain so it was relevant.

Which sections of the report were difficult to understand?

Report was consistently clear.

Other comments on the report and its structure.

Section 1.1 has a typo of "quentitative" on line 10.

What are the stronger features of the work/report?

He manages to assess many of the most important aspects of his report results in a clear and consistent way.

What are the weaker features of the work/report?

It's a bit short and could be extended.

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

Not much as the work could be extended which the author himself clearly states in section 1.1 and 1.2

Summarize the work in a few lines.

Concise and well written.

Questions to author:

1. What exactly is the "frame of reference" that you say will be ignored in this report at the end of section 1.1?

2. What software and technology did you use to implement this?

3. What is the general software architecture of this implementation?

4. What we're the most difficult parts to implement?

5. Do you have any advice to someone seeking to reproduce the work of your report?

6. If you had more time and resources to allocate to this project, what would you have done differently?