FACULTY OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY CTU IN PRAGUE

Review report of a final thesis

Student:	Bc. Guzel Samigullina
Reviewer:	Ing. Milan Dojčinovski, Ph.D.
Thesis title:	Algorithms for collaborative filtering in Point-of-Interest Recommendation Systems
Branch of the study:	Web and Software Engineering

Date: 3. 6. 2019

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.
1. Fulfilment of the assignment	**_1 = assignment fulfilled,_** _2 = assignment fulfilled with minor objections,_ _3 = assignment fulfilled with major objections,_ _4 = assignment not fulfilled_

Criteria description:
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.

Comments:
The goal of the thesis was to develop a recommendation method for POI which extends existing collaborative filtering approaches with content information.
The student completely fulfilled the assignment.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
2. Main written part	*100 (A)*

Criteria description:
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.

Comments:
The thesis is very well structured, it is pleasant to read and easy to follow.
The thesis provide only relevant information for the topic.
The language used is excellent and the citations are complete and in accordance with citation practices and standards.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
3. Non-written part, attachments	*92 (A)*

Criteria description:
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.

Comments:
The implementation is of high quality. The technology used is suitable and adequate.
The implementation would benefit from a better documentation.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
4. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards	*95 (A)*

Criteria description:
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.

Comments:
The thesis provide meaningful results which are enough mature to be published in a scientific research conference.
A minor issue is the lack of proper documentation.

Evaluation criterion:	No evaluation scale.

5. Questions for the defence

Questions:

In the past decade, number of open datasets have been published under the umbrella of the Linked Open Data (LOD) cloud (https://lod-cloud.net).
DBpedia (https://wiki.dbpedia.org), Geonames (https://www.geonames.org) and Linked Geo Data (http://linkedgeodata.org) are few examples of LOD knowledge bases which provide valuable information for many places.

Question: Comment on a possible use of information from these datasets (DBpedia, Geonames, LinkedGeoData) as relevant content information for boosting recommendations.

Evaluation criterion:	*The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).*
6. The overall evaluation	*95 (A)*

Comments:

The thesis is well written and the technical implementation is of high quality. As a minor issue I found the lack of documentation.

Considering all my comments above, I recommend grade A.

Signature of the reviewer: