

Ariunbold Munkhjargal

Here is a **concise but complete opponent-style evaluation** aligned with your form and scoring scheme.



Thesis Evaluation (Opponent Report)

0. Use of AI & suspected plagiarism (not scored but critical)

Assessment: **LOW RISK / ACCEPTABLE**

Evidence & evaluation

- AI usage is **explicitly documented** in Annex 8.8 and methodology sections.
- LLM outputs are:
 - used for **support, benchmarking, and wording**, not for producing results
 - clearly separated from the author's solution (dedicated benchmarking experiment).
- Strong **traceability (artifact chain, workbook, scripts)** prevents hidden copying.
- No signs of:
 - unexplained stylistic inconsistency
 - missing citations
 - suspicious "black-box" results

✅ Conclusion:

No indication of plagiarism. AI use is **transparent, controlled, and methodologically justified** → **best practice level**.

1. Topic & Objectives (max 40)

Evaluation

Strengths

- Very **clear, precisely scoped topic** (Hungarian GP only) → avoids confounding.
- Objectives are:
 - explicit
 - operationalized as "deliverables" (pipeline, OAM, validation)
- Strong **alignment between title, aims, and content**
- Novel combination:
 - motorsport analytics
 - COCO Y0 method
 - reproducible pipeline

Weaknesses

- Title slightly **overloaded and complex**
- "Impact" wording needs interpretation boundary (handled, but still risky)

Score

2. Literature Review (max 40)

Evaluation

Strengths

- **Extensive and relevant literature base**
 - F1 domain + measurement theory + MCDA + COCO
- Strong **conceptual role**
 - defines every concept before implementation
- Excellent **methodological transparency**
- Clear **interpretation boundaries (non-causal, ordinal)**
- Includes **comparative COCO-thesis analysis** (advanced academic maturity)

Weaknesses

- Sometimes **overly long and dense**
- Limited **critical debate** (more justificatory than critical)
- Heavy reliance on **COCO-related internal sources**

Score

3. Presentation of Author's Own Work (max 60)

Evaluation

Strengths (major)

- Outstanding **engineering-level implementation**
 - full pipeline (Python → Excel → solver)
- Strong **reproducibility & auditability**
 - artifact chain, workbook, logs
- Clear **methodological innovations in practice**
 - OAM (A1–A16)
 - rank harmonization
 - COCO Y0 usage
- Multiple **validation layers**
 - inversion consistency
 - sensitivity rerun
 - synthetic data test
- Explicit **limitations and interpretation discipline**
- **AI benchmarking** → highly original contribution

Weaknesses

- No **external validation (real-world correctness)**
- Method depends on:

- ranking → loss of magnitude information
- solver → manual step risks
- A9 “era leakage” issue not resolved

Score

✔ 52 / 60

4. Structure, Style, Formal Aspects (max 40)

Evaluation

Strengths

- Excellent **logical structure**
 - clear separation: theory → implementation → results
- Highly **systematic and consistent terminology**
- Strong **formal rigor**
 - definitions before use
 - KPI definitions before results
- Professional **academic tone**
- Figures, tables, and references are well integrated

Weaknesses

- Style is often:
 - **overly verbose**
 - dense and difficult to read
- Some repetition of methodological statements

Score

✔ 34 / 40

5. Overall Impression (max 20)

Evaluation

- High-level, **methodologically mature thesis**
- Clear **engineering + research integration**
- Strong alignment with **BPROF expectations (deliverable-oriented)**
- Demonstrates:
 - independence
 - critical awareness
 - reproducibility mindset

Main limitation:

→ results are **model-relative, not explanatory**

Score

Final Score

	☰ Category	☰ Score
1	Topic & Objectives	36
2	Literature Review	34
3	Own Work	52
4	Structure & Style	34
5	Overall	17
6	TOTAL	173 / 200

Final Grade

✓ GOOD (160–179 range)

Borderline toward EXCELLENT

General Summary (for the form)

This thesis presents a **highly structured, reproducible, and methodologically explicit workflow** for circuit-specific Formula 1 performance analysis. The topic is well-defined, relevant, and novel in its integration of COCO Y0 methodology with motorsport analytics. The literature review is comprehensive and strongly supports the methodological design, though somewhat overly dense. The author's own contribution is the strongest element: a fully documented, auditable pipeline with multiple validation layers and clear interpretation limits. The use of AI is transparent and well-controlled, with no indication of plagiarism. While the analytical results remain strictly model-relative and non-causal, the thesis demonstrates **excellent engineering rigor, methodological awareness, and academic integrity**.

If you want, I can convert this into a **completed PDF form layout** or a **short oral defense script**.