

Paper Title: Building a Chatbot for a Museum using Rasa Open Source

Paper Author: Alexandru Niculescu and Parvin Abbasi

A. Summary of the paper:

This paper studies the advantages and disadvantages of an open source, RASA, chatbot approach used in museums. Rasa Core consists of two subcomponents: a tracker that memorizes the conversation flow and several policies which the model uses to select appropriate responses from the domain file. The programmers provide feedback to Rasa for generated intent to the message, this is used to evaluate the implementation in the paper.

B. Strengths of the paper:

1. Paper is written in good and precise wordings related to the field.
2. A lot of work is already completed.
3. Introduction and Background draws the reader into the paper very smoothly without having much background knowledge.

C. Weaknesses of the paper:

1. There are grammar mistakes that can be improved using grammarly or other free sources.
2. Abstract should introduce the field of topic, necessity of the chosen project in the field and the conclusion and findings. It seems incomplete, especially in the beginning and at the end.
3. A lot of claims mentioned in the Approach, Methods and Models but are not talked about in the abstract, if you are studying something make sure that you write about what you are doing and what you found in the abstract and introduction a bit, rather vaguely and open endedly stating that you are studying the disadvantages of Rasa.

D. Short evaluations

D1. Coverage of the Field:

It is pretty well covered according to the scope of the paper. Rasa is well studied and also some knowledge or general concept of chatbots are mentioned in the Introduction and Background.

D2. Depth of the topic:

Rasa studies in depth.

D3. Structure:

Structure of the template is followed and paper looks very well organized and structured, just lacks some figures, diagrams, or flowcharts.

D4. Quality of presentation / Clarity:

I wouldn't rate much on this as things are defined pretty widely when we get to the 3rd section but in starting 1 page of the paper it doesn't even talk about what is studies later, just looks like

it was tiptoed around the topic of research in the abstract, intro and background. Try to converge these three sections to your topic of research in a form of a story telling.

D5. Quality of the language:

Perfect!

D6. Critical elaboration of the topic:

Isn't it a good idea to compare Rasa with another approach in a bit detail.

E. Detailed comments to the author:

1. There is a parenthesis '(' in 3rd page, 2nd column, 6th line that never closes.
2. Use grammarly to eliminate the spelling mistakes.
3. Good work :)