Review of Bachelor's Thesis

Student: Karabelly Jozef
Title: Non-Supervised Sentiment Analysis (id 22391)
Reviewer: Landini Federico Nicolás, DCGM FIT BUT

1. Assignment complexity   **more demanding assignment**
The thesis required understanding state-of-the-art (SOTA) neural network architectures and make use of them to compare results with other SOTA techniques.

2. Completeness of assignment requirements   **assignment fulfilled with enhancements**
Although the ablation study was not performed, the techniques explored during the work were not suitable for such study. Nevertheless, the work presents a comparison on several benchmark datasets and the student also collected data from Twitter for the purpose of training the models. Both these aspects were not mentioned in the assignment but were performed with success.

3. Length of technical report   **in usual extent**

4. Presentation level of technical report   **90 p. (A)**
The presentation throughout the thesis is excellent. However, the connection between how the experiments are presented and how they are discussed is only good which creates a big contrast with the rest.

5. Formal aspects of technical report   **95 p. (A)**
The work is of great quality. Very good visually but also in terms of command of the language. Ample use of the vocabulary and good style. There are a few mistakes, especially in terms of quotation marks and not describing an acronym the first time it appears. Overall, it was a very pleasant reading.

6. Literature usage   **100 p. (A)**
The work cites recent publications and relevant bibliography is cited.

7. Implementation results   **90 p. (A)**
The code of the work is available and documented.

8. Utilizability of results
The results are comparable with SOTA results on benchmark datasets. Even though the work opens a few lines for exploring why some methods worked (or not) well and does not go further, the breadth of them is interesting per se. For instance, the benchmark datasets cover different aspects of sentiment analysis which is an interesting reference for further work.

9. Questions for defence
-

10. Total assessment   **95 p. excellent (A)**
The work is very well presented and covers a relevant and current topic. It is very well structured and the ideas are clear. The only point not on pair with the rest is the way the results are presented which could have been better organized to make the reading more straightforward. However, this does not overshadow the quality of the thesis overall.

In Brno 2 June 2020

Landini Federico Nicolás
reviewer