# **REVIEWER'S FORM** for thesis evaluation



### 1. Identification of the student

Student: Emily C. Painter

Thesis: Influence of ambient conditions on building materials: study of material

degradation in the archaeological areas of Prague Castle

1st Institution: Universidade do Minho

2<sup>nd</sup> Institution: Czech Technical University in Prague

Academic year: 2021/2022

## 2. Identification of the reviewer

Name: Cristiana Lara Nunes

Institution: Institute of Theoretical and Applied Mechanics of the Czech Academy of Sciences

Position: Associate scientist

## 3. Fulfillment of thesis goals

exce	ellent ×	above aver. □	average □	below aver. □	weak $\square$
Comme	nts:				
The sub	ject of the the	esis is very interesting a	and has high practi	cal significance for the c	onservation of
the arch	neological site	of the Prague Castle	e. The proposed o	bjectives were successf	iully achieved,
which is	reflected in	the clear presentation	of results and res	spective discussion, as	well as in the
conclus	ions.				

# **REVIEWER'S FORM** for thesis evaluation



## 4. Academic/scientific/technical quality

excellent ×	above aver. □	average □	below aver. □	weak □
Comments:				
•	and fairly well interpr		omplex processing of o	
The student clearly recrystallisation.	eveals a good unders	tanding of the mat	erials and damage mo	echanisms by salt
5. Formal arrangeme	ent of the thesis and	level of language		
excellent	above aver. ×	average □	below aver. □	weak 🗆
Comments:				
The thesis is very we	Il written, and the doc	umentation and pre	esentation of data is of	very high quality.
In general, the thesi	s is well structured, b	out there are secti	ons in the state-of-th	e-art that I would
suggest embedding in	n the methodology and	d results & discuss	ion sections, namely s	ection 4. Damage
Survey and Characte	erisation and respecti	ve sub-sections. A	annexes should be or	dered in order of
annearance in the tex	t (Anney Lie mention	ad firet in the text)		

## REVIEWER'S FORM for thesis evaluation



#### 6. Further comments

### A few suggestions:

- pp. 21: there is a glossary specific for damage assessment of brick and concrete (MDCS: <a href="https://mdcs.monumentenkennis.nl/damageatlas">https://mdcs.monumentenkennis.nl/damageatlas</a>); I also suggest finding a more suitable glossary for describing damage in archaeological wood, e.g., 10.31219/osf.io/x8m4j
- pp. 47: the water absorption by capillarity results show that the mass did not stabilize after the 2h testing period and this may be related to the short duration of the test; for how long was the test continued after the samples reached the maximum capillary moisture content? The term "hydrophobicity" is incorrectly used in this context; I suggest writing that the variations are related to the natural heterogeneity of the stone samples.
- pp. 72: I suggest calculating the drying rate for stages I and II, and the drying index (see standard EN16322: 2013) from the evaporation curves for an easier analysis and comparison of the results.
- HMC results: moisture content (MC) and hygroscopic moisture content (HMC) are expressed as weight %, therefore, the comparison of results of samples with very different water absorption behaviour (stone, mortar, brick) is very complex. I suggest focusing in comparing the HMC results (graphs) between the same types of material. I also suggest expressing the results of MC and HMC in one graph for easier interpretation of the moisture sources. Recently, a charge balance calculations toolkit for overcoming the RUNSALT program ionic balance issues has been developed and can be found here: <a href="https://zenodo.org/record/6280617#">https://zenodo.org/record/6280617#</a>. YtgPE3bRY2x

### 7. Grade: A (excellent)

Use the following scale

A (excellent) B (very good) C (good) D (satisfactory) E (sufficient) F (fail)
---

ITAM, Prague

July 20, 2022

The Reviewer,

Cristiana Lara Paulos Nunes