THIS PART CAN BE REVEALED TO THE APPLICANT

Project ID: P406/10/0434
Reviewer ID: 04024

QUESTIONNAIRE

1) Quality of the project proposal

1a) Originality, scientific importance, prospects of the project and expected benefits of the project for basic research

Characterize the purpose of the project; state in what way the project is relevant and promising; evaluate its competitiveness in the international context and compare its level with the current state of the art in the field:

The project aims to develop a new method for syntactic annotation of Czech, and with it annotate a corpus and develop a parser. The method should be simpler than the already existing PDT,making it more useful for direct use by people. The project resuls also include on-line presentation, in several formats, of the developed treebank.
The project in promising in the fact that it would simplify the quite complex PDT annotation scheme, making it more accessible and useful for a wide variety of "human oriented" applications. Possible theoretical contributions, esp. in an international setting, are more difficult to judge, although the treatment of ambiguity and multiple heads is theoretically interesting.
The main objection to the proposed project is that there is very little detail in terms of the dissemination of primary project results: nowhere is it stated that the developed treebank or tools will be publicly available (as dataset, resp. source code), as is the case with PDT. And without such accessability, the project will most likely fail to achieve the desired impact.

1b) Preparation of the project proposal, targets of the work and proposed deliverables

Evaluate the overall level of preparation of the proposal and the originality of the selected approaches to achieve the project's targets; evaluate planned deliverables (evaluate whether the targets set in the project correspond to the declared purpose of the project and how demanding they are):

The project proposal is in general well written, with appropriate references and a detailed explanation of the methodology. The deliverables are not specified in great detail, esp. as regards the web interface and availability of the project data and software.
As the only means of disseminaton of the direct project results seems to be the web interface, it should have been explained in more detail in the proposal, e.g. will it allow for searching for syntactic constructs.
The project costs are in line with the difficulty of the task.

1c) Concept, methodology and timeline

Evaluate whether the concept of the proposed work and methodology are clearly defined and the degree to which they are elaborated is correct; evaluate the proposed project duration in relation to its targets and the scientific importance of the project; evaluate the timeline of the project in relation to its feasibility:

The methodology is clearly definedm and the proposal offers a good justification for the work to be undertaken. There are not obvious inconsistencies in the proposal, alhough the theoretical impact might not be on an international scale.
The project duration and timeline are appropriate for the planned work.

Quality of the project proposal is possible to evaluate as:

☐ **excellent** ☒ **very good** ☐ **good** ☐ **satisfactory** ☐ **weak**

2) The applicant and his publication level and necessary facilities

Characterize the scientific level of the applicant and the team of workers in terms of their scientific results, number of publications (taking into account the age of the applicant), their quality and rating. State your opinion on the working capacity and facilities of the workplace:

The applicant has good experience in the task to be undertaken, although is somewhat lacking in high-quality international publications and citations. The working capacity and facilities are sufficient to undertake the project.

The qualification of the applicant and the team of workers, their publication level and necessary facilities can be rated as:

☐	**excellent**	☒	**very good**	☐	**good**	☐	**satisfactory**	☐	**weak**

3) Appropriateness and justification of the financial costs (Not necessary to evaluate)			
	YES		**NO**
Please state which requirements you consider unjustified:			

OVERALL COMMENTARY ON THE PROJECT PROPOSAL

Please write your overall comments:

a) Strengths of the project proposal:

The proposed syntactic annotation scheme, which should be much simpler than the existing PDT, and based on traditional grammars, could be very useful in a variety of contexts, such as the study of Czech language. The project also introduces some theoretically interesting notions into the formalism, which could be scientifically interesting.

b) Weaknesses of the project proposal:

The main contribution of the project is more practical than theoretical. It is therefore a great weakness that the project results are not be made generally available; at least this is not stated in the project proposal. The annotated corpus should be made available as a dataset, and the software as open source, as was done with PDT.

c) General comments:

Interesting and potentially useful project, with limited theoretical, but potential great practical results, modulo weakness above.