

OPINION

By Prof. Dr. Stanimir Trifonov

On the dissertation submitted for acquiring the academic degree "Doctor"

in Professional Field 8.4. *Theatre and Film Arts*

Major: *Film Studies, Cinema and Television*

Dissertation title: *The Impact of 3D Technology on the Viewer's Perception of Audiovisual Forms*

by Despot Sebishki

Academic supervisor Assoc. Prof. Elizaveta Boeva, PhD

As we know very well, the cinema was born and lived to his thirty-fourth birthday as a "mute" art. The appearance of sound in 1929, however, only complicated the paths of development of the film image.

Which, in turn, reflects on the psychology of perception of the audiovisual work.

That's why any research on cinema imagery is of interest to all of us. This was one of the reasons why I read Despot Sebishki's work with interest.

The structure of the work is adequate to the requirements: it consists of an introduction, five chapters and a conclusion.

The introduction in its three sections – purpose, subject and object; tasks and methodology of the research, ambitiously leads the reader to the main part. From a formal point of view, the requirements for a doctoral dissertation have been met.

What is discussed in the **first chapter**, devoted to the historical overview of the development of computer graphics and the hologram, is the operational principle of the research subject matter. The introduction amounts to five pages.

The second chapter consists of six different sections with a total volume of fifteen pages and outlines the technical and technological aspects of cinema, stereoscopic film and computer-generated images.

The third chapter attempts to reveal the essence of "the psychology of cinema". The author wanted to dwell on the psychology and physiology of perception of the visual as well as on its impact on the human mind. However, he did it hastily and indiscriminately on as few as six pages!!! (regardless of the confused numbering of pages in the content

of the work!). And this section of film theory is more than fundamental, and the research work devoted to this subject matter is abundant.

The fourth chapter consists of eight sections and one initiated but unfinished passage (about the metaverse). Here again the chapter is full of technical descriptions and retellings, which confuses the reader about the essence of the dissertation.

Only in **Chapter Five** (and it begins on page 122) does the doctoral student focus on the most important thing in the dissertation – "trends and author's work", which is quite vague and the general a wording for a chapter title. Its modest size and six sections are extremely insufficient for the importance of the problem – the aesthetic, philosophical, ethical and artistic aspects of a seemingly merely technical phenomenon.

In the conclusion, the author rushes to shed inexpensive prophecies about the future of cinema, which makes the reader doubt his qualities even more strongly.

As is well known, when one accepts the desired as real, the pain of encountering reality is hard to bear. In the case of this dissertation, I would very much like to spare the author such an experience. Moreover, it is not impossible for the text to be translated abroad, and this will now also have a bearing on the representation of Bulgarian academic life abroad. And our individual presence in it.

Finally, I would like to say that the initially felt curiosity about this work was destroyed by its superficiality and mediocrity. These features bitterly disappointed me.

I could list other shortcomings, but the most striking one is the lack of filmographic references (of titles quoted and/or used). This is absurd even for a modest undergraduate thesis!

I vote "No".

Prof. Stanimir Trifonov, PhD