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II. EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA
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*How demanding was the assigned project?*

Understanding and implementing Finite Horizon POMDP solvers is a challenging task. It involves understanding the non-trivial formalism of (PO)MDPs as well as correctly translating this mathematical framework into correct code.

**Fulfilment of assignment**

*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.*
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Prior work is adequately cited and the student’s work is clearly separated from existing methods via the individual
packages that were implemented.
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*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.*

The thesis in general represents a very well-executed scientific work. The implemented solvers have already been known but their implementation in the growing ecosystem of the Julia language is a very valuable contribution not only to the scientific community.
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