



Review report of a final thesis

Student: Bc. Martin Piták
Reviewer: Ing. Karel Klouda, Ph.D.
Thesis title: Comic2vec: Vector representation of comics
Branch of the study: Knowledge Engineering

Date: 4. 6. 2019

<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.</i>
1. Fulfilment of the assignment	1 = assignment fulfilled, 2 = assignment fulfilled with minor objections, 3 = assignment fulfilled with major objections, 4 = assignment not fulfilled
<i>Criteria description:</i> 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.	
<i>Comments:</i> All the requirements in the assignment have been fulfilled. The topic is interesting and challenging, and the author has been very keen to get good results and has done a lot of work.	
<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i>
2. Main written part	85 (B)
<i>Criteria description:</i> 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. 26/2017, 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.	
<i>Comments:</i> The text is well written and mostly understandable. Still, there are some weak parts: In general, the mathematical formulas are sometimes stated without punctuation or the notation is confusing. E.g., in the description of K-means, the notions of centroid and cluster are not distinguished and denoted properly. At page 25, it is not clear what the star * means. Unfortunately, the description of Accuracy used to measure the quality of resulting embeddings is described vaguely and with non-sense sentences.	
<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i>
3. Non-written part, attachments	95 (A)
<i>Criteria description:</i> 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.	
<i>Comments:</i> The resulting embeddings are well described; it is well explained why the methods used are a reasonable choice. And, finally, the results seem promising. The created dataset is also an important contribution of this work.	
<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i>
4. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards	95 (A)
<i>Criteria description:</i> 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.	
<i>Comments:</i> As said above, the results are promising and can be used in machine learning studies of comics.	
<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>No evaluation scale.</i>

5. Questions for the defence

Criteria description:

Formulate questions that the student should answer during the Presentation and defence of the FT in front of the SFE Committee (use a bullet list).

Questions:

1. Can you please explain once again how the accuracy of the embeddings was measured?
2. Can you explain the suspiciously high accuracy of the Inception V3 experiment with 0.001 learning rate?

Evaluation criterion:

The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).

6. The overall evaluation

92 (A)

Criteria description:

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.

Comments:

With respect to all that has been said above, I suggest grade A.

Signature of the reviewer: