Dissertation

* Will there be enough to talk about without addition of AM? Not much to reference so far
* Will start experiments section to improve accuracy
* I need to be careful to make sure the project is coherent, though the focus on improving the periodic sentence detection rather than shifting to AM should help with that
* I say that we are reducing the input variance to improve accuracy, but is there more to it? Is there a reason for picking periodic sentences specifically? – each function applied to source text gives evidence towards whether it’s an argument
* Need a clear reason for doing this, is there a link between periodic sentences and arguments as suggested by Simon and on ARG@Napier student projects page?
* Keep referring to ‘if I do the argument mining’, a lot of the text is like this, need another angle to talk about AM as that is where a lot of background research can come from – otherwise all references will be periodic sentence linguistics stuff

Project

* Sounds like a good idea to focus on improving current features rather than moving to argument mining
* Currently 83% accuracy is purely detecting periodic sentences, it does give a boolean “argument?” value, but is mostly arbitrary currently – I will use Canary to detect this as suggested, so a bit of AM but not full Canary integration
* Should I find the actual arguments themselves? I interpret no from the feedback.
* I have got a start on SADFace output but might drop it in favour of the other options we have discussed, such as improving the accuracy and detecting whether there is an argument – without actually specifying the argument or doing anything with it at this time.
* Won’t fully integrate Canary into UI. Was suggested that I keep my functions separate from canary – at the moment I have all my features in a library called canary as I was wanting to merge them together from the beginning – so I might attempt it, but only use the features I need rather than fully integrating my project into Canary
* Agree about the UI being a good idea, but should it just be a dev/demo tool and not a part of the project? – potentially good for people like me when I started this for understanding what a periodic sentence is, could throw a sentence in and find out, with a page about why. Just a thought, probably too much scope?

If brought up

* No need to trim trees as I have implemented the cheat of checking the height of each node and it works well – takes no time at all so no need to optimise here
* I misinterpreted the algorithm – I’m only looking at a single depth level (just below root) and then looking at the subtrees that are rooted at that level

Project brief from ARG@Napier group website

* <http://arg.napier.ac.uk/page/admin/studentprojects/> Specifically “Developing an algorithm to automatically detect periodic sentences, classify them as argument or non-argument, and convert them into argumentation structures that are saved using the [SADFace](http://arg.napier.ac.uk/page/project/sadface)format (developed at ENU). NB. Periodic sentences often encapsulate an entire argument, including premises and conclusion, into a single sentence, e.g. “The beach, with white sand, crystal clear water, and palm trees, is a favorite hangout for the locals.” but they are problematic because they may have various forms, and sometimes the same form can express an argument and at other times the sentence does not contain an argument.

Demo