



# Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

**Supervisor:** Ing. Michal Valenta, Ph.D.  
**Student:** Aydin Misirzade  
**Thesis title:** Web Application WeFix  
**Branch / specialization:** Web and Software Engineering  
**Created on:** 4 June 2022

## Evaluation criteria

### 1. Fulfillment of the assignment

- ▶ [1] assignment fulfilled
- [2] assignment fulfilled with minor objections
- [3] assignment fulfilled with major objections
- [4] assignment not fulfilled

The assignment is fulfilled. The author designed implemented and tested a specific web application. The topic is relatively simple, but yet sufficient for a bachelor thesis.

### 2. Main written part

82 /100 (B)

The text is well readable, it is formally correct, and the author cited enough relevant sources. The text provides good project documentation including motivations (a business story), functional and non-functional requirements, design, implementation, and testing. I appreciate, the text contains some kind of discussion related to correct architecture, design and implementation approaches.

### 3. Non-written part, attachments

90 /100 (A)

Chosen technologies used for both implementation and testing are suitable for the project. I appreciate the fact that student totally rewrite the application from the time he nearly posted the thesis in the previous term. Also, the usage of Google Maps API in the application is a well-done piece of the work.

### 4. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards

72 /100 (C)

Even though the application is from the end-user point of view complete and usable, including the deployment in the public domain (unfortunately unreachable at the moment of writing the review), I do not much believe it will be used in practice. To be practically used, it requires some well-done business plan in order to make service

providers fill correct data and service consumers to evaluate the services. Such a plan is not meant in the thesis.

## 5. Activity of the student

- [1] excellent activity
- ▶ [2] **very good activity**
- [3] average activity
- [4] weaker, but still sufficient activity
- [5] insufficient activity

Mainly in the later stages of the project, the activity of student was good.

## 6. Self-reliance of the student

- [1] excellent self-reliance
- ▶ [2] **very good self-reliance**
- [3] average self-reliance
- [4] weaker, but still sufficient self-reliance
- [5] insufficient self-reliance

The topic of the thesis was the author's idea, he worked well and with good self-reliance on the design and implementation. I supervised mainly the text of the thesis.

## The overall evaluation

85 /100 (B)

In the end, the student provided a very good design and implementation work. The thesis topic is relatively simple yet fine for the bachelor thesis. The level of text documentation is also very good.

## **Instructions**

### **Fulfillment of the assignment**

Assess whether the submitted FT defines the objectives sufficiently and in line with the assignment; whether the objectives are formulated correctly and fulfilled sufficiently. In the comment, specify the points of the assignment that have not been met, assess the severity, impact, and, if appropriate, also the cause of the deficiencies. If the assignment differs substantially from the standards for the FT or if the student has developed the FT beyond the assignment, describe the way it got reflected on the quality of the assignment's fulfilment and the way it affected your final evaluation.

### **Main written part**

Evaluate whether the extent of the FT is adequate to its content and scope: are all the parts of the FT contentful and necessary? Next, consider whether the submitted FT is actually correct – are there factual errors or inaccuracies?

Evaluate the logical structure of the FT, the thematic flow between chapters and whether the text is comprehensible to the reader. Assess whether the formal notations in the FT are used correctly. Assess the typographic and language aspects of the FT, follow the Dean's Directive No. 52/2021, Art. 3.

Evaluate whether the relevant sources are properly used, quoted and cited. Verify that all quotes are properly distinguished from the results achieved in the FT, thus, that the citation ethics has not been violated and that the citations are complete and in accordance with citation practices and standards. Finally, evaluate whether the software and other copyrighted works have been used in accordance with their license terms.

### **Non-written part, attachments**

Depending on the nature of the FT, comment on the non-written part of the thesis. For example: SW work – the overall quality of the program. Is the technology used (from the development to deployment) suitable and adequate? HW – functional sample. Evaluate the technology and tools used. Research and experimental work – repeatability of the experiment.

### **Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards**

Depending on the nature of the thesis, estimate whether the thesis results could be deployed in practice; alternatively, evaluate whether the results of the FT extend the already published/known results or whether they bring in completely new findings.

### **Activity of the student**

From your experience with the course of the work on the thesis and its outcome, review the student's activity while working on the thesis, his/her punctuality when meeting the deadlines and whether he/she consulted you as he/she went along and also, whether he/she was well prepared for these consultations.

### **Self-reliance of the student**

From your experience with the course of the work on the thesis and its outcome, assess the student's ability to develop independent creative work.

### **The overall evaluation**

Summarize which of the aspects of the FT affected your grading process the most. The overall grade does not need to be an arithmetic mean (or other value) calculated from the evaluation in the previous criteria. Generally, a well-fulfilled assignment is assessed by grade A.