Computer Science

Opponent(s):

Georges Darakji, Jan Johansson

Respondent(s):

Ferenc Grigo

A Toolbox for Algorithmic, Adaptive Music

Opposition Report, C/D-level

2005:xx

1 A General Evaluation of the Project

The project is of substantial size and is described in very great detail and it is clear that the author has extensive knowledge in the area. Aside from the very good detailed description of Conductor, we are missing an overview of the functionality and features of the software. Also, while plenty of references are used, there are several references to Wikipedia which may not be a reliable source.

2 Comments on the Project in Relation to the Dissertation

2.1 Title

The title describes the dissertation well, although several references in the dissertation refer to it under a slightly different title.

2.2 Dissertation Layout

The dissertation is structured in a way which we found very easy to follow.

We would have appreciated a section which gives an overview of what one can actually do with Conductor.

2.3 Scientific Method

The functionality of Conductor is well evaluated by several tests and the problems are discussed.

2.4 Argumentation and Conclusions

Design decisions are very well argued. It is good that many sections end with conclusions. It is clear that the author has a good understanding in the subject. The author has done well in showing the possible uses of this kind of work.

2.5 The Abstract

The abstract provides a good summary of the dissertation.

2.6 Language Aspects

The dissertation is well written, using a language which is easy to follow. We like the quotes which introduce some sections (such as 2.1 and 4.3).

There are some inconsequent spellings of product names and abbreviations used throughout the dissertation.

2.7 References and Sources

Although many references are used to support the arguments, there are many references to Wikipedia articles, which may not always be very reliable.

2.8 General Comments on the Project

It is obvious that a substantial amount of work has been done, which has also been well described in great detail in the dissertation.

3 Chapter by Chapter Evaluation of the Dissertation

3.1 Chapter 1

This chapter gives a good introduction to the relevance of the subject, and to the structure and content of the dissertation.

3.2 Chapter 2

This chapter supplies a comprehensive introduction to many of the different concepts. Many of the concepts are still difficult to understand, but we believe good efforts were made to explain them.

3.3 Chapter 3

This chapter gives a very detailed and complete description of how Conductor is composed and the design decisions are well argued. However, we suggest inserting a new section before the current 3.1, and there provide an overview of Conductor's purpose and features.

3.4 Chapter 4

Also this chapter is well written. Relevant tests are performed and failed tests are discussed.

3.5 Chapter 5

We suggest using other terms than "market" to describe the possible applications for the work. Otherwise, also this chapter was well written and gave a good conclusion of the work.

4 Final Comments

Well done!

Minor corrections:

- The dissertation is on some locations, such as in the abstract, referred to as "Building a toolbox…"
- All level 4 headings have a different font than other headings and text
- Java, MIDI and MidiShare is spelled inconsistently using upper and lower case letters
- Code listings: Consider using smaller tabs to indent the code to avoid misplaced line breaks. Use the Courier New font instead?
- Most table cells have first line indentation and text align set to "justify"
- On several places, text is written "notes/ chords" – it should be "notes/chords" (no space)
- Some product names, such as Eclipse, are written with lower case
- Page 17: "Even although" →"Although"
- Page 38: "an music generation algorithm"
- Pages 55 and 56: "re- orchestration" → "re-orchestration" or "reorchestration"
- Page 58: Page ends with a heading
- Page 72: "The it in this instance" (if this error is in the original text, add "[sic]"?)
- Page 76: "DieHarder: A free (GPL) C Random Number Test Suite" as a bullet point
- Page 86, section 3.3.2.3: Which are the design reasons for implementing the bootstrapper class as a singleton?
- Page 95: Figure is split across pages
- Page 114: beatOf or beatTo?
- Page 126: Unfinished sentence in 4.4.5.3 ("First of all,")
- Page 127: come → came
- Page 133: There are two references with the identifier [AnCl07]