



Review report of a final thesis

Student: Andriy Nazim
Reviewer: prof. Dr. Ing. Petr Kroha, CSc.
Thesis title: Extraction of linguistic information from Wikipedia
Branch of the study: Web and Software Engineering

Date: 28. 5. 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> The task has been fulfilled. The goals are good formulated. The scope of 60 pages corresponds with Master thesis demands. Of course, the extraction of linguistic information from Wikipedia is in common a big and never-ending story.	
<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i>
2. Main written part	95 (A)
<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 work has been very good and carefully written. I found some mistakes concerning word order, e.g., "For front-end have been used Bootstraps styles" (Page 45) , some unusual word, e.g., "begging store" (page 45), and some mistakes concerning commas, e.g., "Just over the years 2016-2018 90% of the world data was created" . It has to be noticed that most students are doing much more mistakes in their native language than the author done.	
<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i>
3. Non-written part, attachments	80 (B)
<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 graphical part of the work is very good. Only, Figure 11 has not much sense because it is too small. In general, many figures use fonts that are too small.	
<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> The results achieved are very good, and they can be used in next related works.	
<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:

No questions

Evaluation criterion:

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

6. The overall evaluation

95 (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:

The Master thesis is very good written, and it contains everything what a successful work should contain.

Signature of the reviewer: