

I. IDENTIFICATION DATA

Thesis title:	Dataset for Automated Fact Checking in Czech Language
Author's name:	Herbert Ullrich
Type of thesis :	master
Faculty/Institute:	Faculty of Electrical Engineering (FEE)
Department:	CS
Thesis reviewer:	Gustav Šír
Reviewer's department:	CS

II. EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA

Assignment	challenging
<i>How demanding was the assigned project?</i>	
Perhaps not exactly challenging in itself, but the assignment is quite unique, given the scope of the overarching project.	

Fulfilment of assignment	fulfilled
<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>	
Fulfilled to the letter, in a highly comprehensive fashion.	

Methodology	outstanding
<i>Comment on the correctness of the approach and/or the solution methods.</i>	
Correct and very systematic.	

Technical level	A - excellent.
<i>Is the thesis technically sound? How well did the student employ expertise in the field of his/her field of study? Does the student explain clearly what he/she has done?</i>	
Sound and clear. Despite our NLP course being shut down at FEL, this is a solid work in the field. The student thus surely had to study a wide range of related materials on his own, which is commendable.	

Formal and language level, scope of thesis	A - excellent.
<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>	
This is where the thesis stands out very clearly. I commend the student highly for the organization, presentation and typography (including thoughtful color selection). The English level is completely professional. Within this category, this is one of the best theses I've ever seen.	

Selection of sources, citation correctness	A - excellent.
<i>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?</i>	
A clear separation line from an earlier work is perhaps the only slightly problematic point of the thesis, as it is a part of a bigger project, as well as it is based on adaptation of a range of existing technologies. The student does a good job in their specification throughout the thesis, still, given its complexity and scope, I got myself sometimes lost on this matter. It is quite clear in the data collection/annotation parts, but not so much in the rest. Nevertheless, the citation etiquette seems correct, so it's still A.	

Additional commentary and evaluation (optional)
<i>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.</i>

See below

This is a very nice, practically oriented, thesis. The scope of modern technologies used is exhaustive, and the approach seems professional to me. The textual part then only reflects this level, too. I found it very pleasant to read and highly comprehensive. Clearly, a very substantial amount of work went into this.

Some small comments:

I'd use "Section 1.2" instead of just "1.2" as references in the text.

Quite a number of missing periods at the end of sentences, and sometimes 3 instead (but the quality of text is outstanding otherwise)

I appreciate the joke at page 43, but a thesis is not a place to be funny (except the acknowledgment section)

p.45: models in their "cased" defaults?

You really overfit the model with but a single epoch? (how about decreasing learning rate)

III. OVERALL EVALUATION, QUESTIONS FOR THE PRESENTATION AND DEFENSE OF THE THESIS, SUGGESTED GRADE

Summarize your opinion on the thesis and explain your final grading. Pose questions that should be answered during the presentation and defense of the student's work.

I suggest to briefly distinguish the exact personal contributions made by the student himself during the presentation to the committee.

The grade that I award for the thesis is **A - excellent**.

Date: **26.5.2021**

Signature: