

Authors: Angelina Von Gegerfelt, Kashmir Klingestedt

Report: Usability of Text and Speech as Input Methods for Natural Language Interfaces

Reviewed by: Jesper Sandström

Title and Abstract

The title and the abstract reflect the content of the report very well. The abstract succinctly summarizes the entire report.

Introduction

The problem statement is presented early and clearly. The aims of the project were outlined well and the scope/aim/purpose of the report were easy to identify. However, these sections felt a bit lacking. For example, the section outlining the report's purpose felt slightly under motivated. The relevancy of this investigation was touched upon, but could definitely be explored in more detail.

Background

The writers seem to have a solid grasp on both the current state of NLI research and its history. However, this section seemed to lack coherency. The links between the different paragraphs felt abrupt. This could probably be fixed without making the section too verbose.

Method

This section provided plenty of information about the tools which currently exist for implementing these types of systems. It also roughly outlined the approach of the report. However, far more information about the actual implementation is required. Only surface level details about the games were discussed, and the authors did not explain how the various libraries were used. The selection of these libraries should also be motivated.

Results

All of the results were presented clearly and were easy to follow for the most part. The authors used bar graphs very effectively to highlight their most important results. However, many of the tables presented contained very little information and seemed superfluous. The text explaining the graphs also felt a bit lacking. It might be helpful to tell the reader exactly what they should be looking for in each graph (especially the line graphs).

Discussion and Conclusion

The discussion helped summarize the results, but a true analysis of the results was missing. The implications of these findings on the field should be explicitly stated, and the limitations and strengths of the investigation could be discussed in far more detail. The conclusions seem reasonable given the results. Side note: there doesn't seem to be any real reason to present the conclusion as a separate chapter.

Overall characteristics of good-quality written presentation

The content of the report is coherent in the sense that it falls in line with the research question. However, the different sections of the report could be linked together far more. Clear transitions would make the report much easier to grasp.

The writing in its current state does not reach up to academic standards. For example, American and British spellings are mixed (ex. “recognizer” is American whereas “behaviour” is British), and sentences often contain redundancy. However, this could be fixed quite easily. The writing, while perhaps a bit informal, is easy to understand for the most part.