

I. IDENTIFICATION DATA

Thesis title:	Learning CNNs from Weakly annotated facial images
Author's name:	Ćirić Stefan
Type of thesis :	master
Faculty/Institute:	Faculty of Electrical Engineering (FEE)
Department:	Department of computer science
Thesis reviewer:	Ing. Vojtěch Franc, Ph.D.
Reviewer's department:	Department of Cybernetics

II. EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA

Assignment	ordinarily challenging
<i>How demanding was the assigned project?</i>	
The task was to implement well defined method and to evaluate it on provided data.	

Fulfilment of assignment	fulfilled with minor objections
<i>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.</i>	
A basic version of the method was implemented only. There is a large room for improvements that has not been exploited. On the other hand, on top of the assignments the student implemented an annotation tool and he collected a manual annotation for a subset of the data that will be useful.	

Activity and independence when creating final thesis	C - good.
<i>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.</i>	
The student was regularly coming to consultations. His ability to work independently was sufficient.	

Technical level	C - good.
<i>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?</i>	
The clarity of the text and explanation of the proposed method in particular are not optimal. To understand the content sometimes requires more effort than necessary. On the other hand parts of the thesis, e.g. graphs and figures, are very illustrative and helpful to get the problem.	

Formal level and language level, scope of thesis	D - satisfactory.
<i>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?</i>	
The text is fragmented to too many sections. The mathematical notation is not always used consistently, some symbols have not been defined and the formulas do not always bring clarity to the problem. Language is clear. English is very good.	

Selection of sources, citation correctness	B - very good.
---	----------------

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?

Survey of related works and their connection to the thesis is very good.

Additional commentary and evaluation (optional)

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

The assignments of the thesis were formally fulfilled but unfortunately only the basic variants of the method was implemented. On the other hand, in addition to the assignments the student implemented an annotation tool and used it to collect a useful data. A drawback is the clarity of text and its technical soundness. Despite the weaknesses the student did a solid work which in my opinion deserves the grade C-good.

The grade that I award for the thesis is .

Date:

Signature:

