THESIS SUPERVISOR'S REPORT

I. IDENTIFICATION DATA

Thesis title:	**Naturalistic Control of Eyes of a Humanoid Robot during an Interactive Game**
Author's name:	**Daria Mikhaylovskaya**
Type of thesis :	bachelor
Faculty/Institute:	Faculty of Electrical Engineering (FEE)
Department:	Department of Cybernetics
Thesis reviewer:	Doc. Mgr. Matěj Hoffmann, PhD, Ing. Jakub Rozlivek
Reviewer's department:	Department of Cybernetics

II. EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA

Assignment **challenging**

How demanding was the assigned project?

The assignment required the student to work with a real robot and there was the social robotics aspect - work with participants and questionnaires.

Fulfillment 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.

The student implemented the eyes controller using an algebraic approach. The student deployed additional behaviors that were beyond the assignment (blinking, small body movements) that improved the human-likeness of the robot behaviors.

Activity and independence when creating final thesis **C - good.**

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.

The student had a lot of other commitments and could not devote enough time to the thesis throughout the whole envisioned period. Detailed supervision from the supervisor specialist was required to develop the solution. The time management of the student was not great. The final document was completed very shortly before the deadline.

Technical level **C - good.**

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 implemented eyes gazing at the human keypoints does not work accurately. The desired target should be in the center of the image if joint limits allow that. However, the target is often in the middle of the right (left) half of the image instead. Overall the code should be in better shape which would help debugging issues like this.

Formal level and language level, scope of thesis **B - very 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 thesis has adequate scope and presentation, including appropriate schematics where relevant.

Selection of sources, citation correctness **A - excellent.**

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?

Sources were appropriately selected and cited.

Additional commentary and evaluation (optional)

THESIS SUPERVISOR'S REPORT

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.
Please insert your comments here.

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.

The student had difficulty implementing some standard robotics theory. The code developed does not meet the highest standards.

On the other hand, the student developed and deployed something on a complex humanoid robot and evaluated it in a preliminary user study including psychological questionnaires.

The grade that I award for the thesis is **C - good.**

Date: **5.6.2024** Signature: