



Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

Supervisor: Ing. Jan Šedivý, CSc.
Student: Lukáš Marek
Thesis title: Digital Persona
Branch / specialization: Web and Software Engineering, specialization Computer Graphics
Created on: 16 May 2023

Evaluation criteria

1. Fulfillment of the assignment

- ▶ [1] assignment fulfilled
- [2] assignment fulfilled with minor objections
- [3] assignment fulfilled with major objections
- [4] assignment not fulfilled

The student has fulfilled exceptionally well all the assignments.

2. Main written part 95 /100 (A)

This thesis explores the potential of virtual, talking personas exploring computer graphics and conversational artificial intelligence. The extent of the FT is adequate and correctly describes the current technologies. The FT is logically structured and uses correct formal notation. It is evident that the FT takes advantage of the ChatGPT tremendous syntactic and semantic benefits and uses the Latex CVUT template making sure the typography is excellent. The FT lists many relevant sources.

3. Non-written part, attachments 95 /100 (A)

The FT includes a practical example of a voice-enabled avatar. It also includes an Unreal project allowing to use of avatars in different environments. The FT also includes Python code. The only objection I can raise the code is not commented.

4. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards 100 /100 (A)

All the submitted examples are very practical and can become parts of real, interesting, and engaging applications.

5. Activity of the student

- ▶ [1] excellent activity
- [2] very good activity
- [3] average activity
- [4] weaker, but still sufficient activity
- [5] insufficient activity

The student works in our department for almost four years and takes part in several of our projects. He is very active and hardworking contributing in many aspects to our development.

6. Self-reliance of the student

- ▶ [1] excellent self-reliance
- [2] very good self-reliance
- [3] average self-reliance
- [4] weaker, but still sufficient self-reliance
- [5] insufficient self-reliance

Our group focuses on the NLP, The student contributed to the interaction and graphical parts of our applications and did not have too much help from our team. Consequently, he had to be self-sufficient and self-motivated.

The overall evaluation

100 /100 (A)

It would be wonderful if we had more students who displayed a similar level of focus and creativity. Lukas, in particular, has dedicated considerable effort to studying various applications and materials, and as a result, he has produced outstanding work by effectively utilizing the latest technology. His commitment to the assignment is evident, and therefore, he deserves to be rewarded with an A grade.

Instructions

Fulfillment of the assignment

Assess whether the submitted FT defines the objectives sufficiently and in line with the assignment; whether the objectives are formulated correctly and fulfilled sufficiently. In the comment, specify the points of the assignment that have not been met, assess the severity, impact, and, if appropriate, also the cause of the deficiencies. If the assignment differs substantially from the standards for the FT or if the student has developed the FT beyond the assignment, describe the way it got reflected on the quality of the assignment's fulfilment and the way it affected your final evaluation.

Main written part

Evaluate whether the extent of the FT is adequate to its content and scope: are all the parts of the FT contentful and necessary? Next, consider whether the submitted FT is actually correct – are there factual errors or inaccuracies?

Evaluate the logical structure of the FT, the thematic flow between chapters and whether the text is comprehensible to the reader. Assess whether the formal notations in the FT are used correctly. Assess the typographic and language aspects of the FT, follow the Dean's Directive No. 52/2021, Art. 3.

Evaluate whether the relevant sources are properly used, quoted and cited. Verify that all quotes are properly distinguished from the results achieved in the FT, thus, that the citation ethics has not been violated and that the citations are complete and in accordance with citation practices and standards. Finally, evaluate whether the software and other copyrighted works have been used in accordance with their license terms.

Non-written part, attachments

Depending on the nature of the FT, comment on the non-written part of the thesis. For example: SW work – the overall quality of the program. Is the technology used (from the development to deployment) suitable and adequate? HW – functional sample. Evaluate the technology and tools used. Research and experimental work – repeatability of the experiment.

Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards

Depending on the nature of the thesis, estimate whether the thesis results could be deployed in practice; alternatively, evaluate whether the results of the FT extend the already published/known results or whether they bring in completely new findings.

Activity of the student

From your experience with the course of the work on the thesis and its outcome, review the student's activity while working on the thesis, his/her punctuality when meeting the deadlines and whether he/she consulted you as he/she went along and also, whether he/she was well prepared for these consultations.

Self-reliance of the student

From your experience with the course of the work on the thesis and its outcome, assess the student's ability to develop independent creative work.

The overall evaluation

Summarize which of the aspects of the FT affected your grading process the most. The overall grade does not need to be an arithmetic mean (or other value) calculated from the evaluation in the previous criteria. Generally, a well-fulfilled assignment is assessed by grade A.