

# THESIS SUPERVISOR'S REPORT

#### I. IDENTIFICATION DATA

Thesis title: Research Trend Detection

Author's name: Shuhailo Oleksii

**Type of thesis:** master

**Faculty/Institute:** Faculty of Electrical Engineering (FEE) **Department:** Department of Computer Science

**Thesis reviewer:** Ing. Radek Mařík, CSc.

**Reviewer's department:** Department of telecommunication engineering

#### II. EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA

Assignment challenging

How demanding was the assigned project?

Natural language processing methods are not covered by the FEE study programs

### **Fulfilment of assignment**

fulfilled

How well does the thesis fulfil the assigned task? Have the primary goals been achieved? Which assigned tasks have been incompletely covered, and which parts of the thesis are overextended? Justify your answer.

All assigned tasks were covered.

# Activity and independence when creating final thesis

D - satisfactory.

Assess whether the student had a positive approach, whether the time limits were met, whether the conception was regularly consulted and whether the student was well prepared for the consultations. Assess the student's ability to work independently.

We with the student kept regular weekly consultations. Although the student demonstrates the ability to understand even complex concepts of the assigned problem, I was sometimes surprised that he had difficulty analytically identifying and resolving issues in implementing the proposed procedures and evaluating the results achieved.

Technical level D - satisfactory.

Is the thesis technically sound? How well did the student employ expertise in his/her field of study? Does the student explain clearly what he/she has done?

The student has no difficulty articulating or understanding concepts and visions. However, he misses some small technical details of the methods, without which they do not work properly. Thus, the student seems to lack sufficient practice in identifying and troubleshooting such glitches.

#### Formal level and language level, scope of thesis

C - good.

Are formalisms and notations used properly? Is the thesis organized in a logical way? Is the thesis sufficiently extensive? Is the thesis well-presented? Is the language clear and understandable? Is the English satisfactory?

The English is satisfactory. The text is understandable. The student avoids formal technical expression in his/her work and prefers more extensive textual discussions. However, in many cases these are not supported by references to sources. This raises the question of how much the reader can trust the text. Although the student describes the objectives very reasonably in the introduction of his paper, I am not entirely sure that he has been able to convert these abstract formulations into technical terms and solution procedures.

## Selection of sources, citation correctness

D - satisfactory.

Does the thesis make adequate reference to earlier work on the topic? Was the selection of sources adequate? Is the student's original work clearly distinguished from earlier work in the field? Do the bibliographic citations meet the standards?



# THESIS SUPERVISOR'S REPORT

As mentioned, the student quite often does not cite the resources used, although it is clear that he has not personally conducted experiments and similar analysis. A number of articles have been suggested to the student that do not appear in the thesis. Also, the research done is rather limited.

# Additional commentary and evaluation (optional)

Comment on the overall quality of the thesis, its novelty and its impact on the field, its strengths and weaknesses, the utility of the solution that is presented, the theoretical/formal level, the student's skillfulness, etc.

The student spent several weeks looking for bugs in the implementation and fixing them. The student also spent precious time implementing the method according to Xiao et all 2021, some details of which are missing in the paper. As a result, he had very little time left to perform the experiments and write the thesis. Many of the experiments that came into consideration were not performed at all. Therefore, the thesis was produced very quickly and the results contain uncorrected text in several places.

# III. OVERALL EVALUATION, QUESTIONS FOR THE PRESENTATION AND DEFENSE OF THE THESIS, SUGGESTED GRADE

Summarize your opinion on the thesis and explain your final grading.

We had quite fruitful discussions with the student, but the student had trouble translating them into a technical environment.

The grade that I award for the thesis is **D** - satisfactory.

Date: **14.6.2023** Signature: