



Review report of a final thesis

Reviewer: Ing. Miroslav Čepek, Ph.D.
Student: Bc. Herman Tiumentsev
Thesis title: Machine learning based approach for summarizing governance proposals for decentralized autonomous organizations
Branch / specialization: Knowledge Engineering
Created on: 5 June 2024

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 thesis assignment is fulfilled in all details.

2. Main written part 90/100 (A)

Text of the thesis is in accordance to the assignment. The thesis includes comprehensive review of Decentralised Autonomous Organisations related topics as well as techniques for text summarisation. I like student's attempt to design the architecture of the application including proposal of UX/UI design. The experiments and evaluation metrics are well chosen and demonstrate well the points the student is making. I'd appreciate more specific examples of inputs and outputs to have better hand-on illustration of the capabilities of models.

3. Non-written part, attachments 90/100 (A)

Used libraries and concepts are appropriate to the task. The implementation of the experiments is done mainly in the Jupyter notebooks, which is fine. I'd just appreciate better structuring of the code - using of the markdown cells with titles and short summary of that will happen in the code.

4. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards

95 /100 (A)

The results use state of the art techniques on novel data. I see great potential in finalising the proposed model and deploy it to practice.

The overall evaluation

95 /100 (A)

Overall, I like the thesis and the approach the student took. The student had spend great deal of time and efforts on reviews, design of experiments and execution of experiments. I appreciate that student is thinking about designing the application architecture.

I definitively recommend this thesis for defence.

Questions for the defense

I am missing the implementation of the proposed architecture, although you hint in the text that a beta version exists. Did I miss it in the archive? Does it really exist? Can you show few screenshots/demonstrate functionality?

Can you show an example of the proposal and it's summarisation?

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.

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.