**FACULTY
OF INFORMATION
TECHNOLOGY
CTU IN PRAGUE**

Review report of a final thesis

Reviewer:	Ing. Jan Bizničenko
Student:	Hlib Yarovyi
Thesis title:	Information System for Draw Competitions
Branch / specialization:	Web and Software Engineering
Created on:	6 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

All objectives have been fulfilled. Result is fully working backend usable for various draw competitions.

2. Main written part   55 /100 (E)

The written part is well structured, with appropriate level of English without any major language-related problems. The student analyses goals and requirements with great detail and quality. Design of the application is also written thoroughly, supported by useful diagrams of various kinds. In contrast, rest of the content of the written part is very brief. For example, there is absolutely no research or reasoning related to used technologies and no research of microservice-based solutions to somehow similar problems. Although student shows software development cycle where evaluation is important for further steps, the evaluation done by the student is not described sufficiently to draw any conclusions.

There are 19 bibliographical items: 1 book on software development practices, 1 wikipedia article with definition of lottery, few websites with examples of lotteries and rest are links to websites of technologies used by the student. In cases of online sources, there are no citation dates and authors of these sources are wrong in few cases (for example Swagger is not an author, but a name of the website and product - author of Swagger and the website is SmartBear software).

3. Non-written part, attachments   87 /100 (B)

Implementation provided by the student is fully working, uses appropriate technologies and the code is well structured and understandable. Student provided deployment instructions and API documentation using Swagger. What I am missing is general "how-to-use" with overview and general description, for potential users, in the project itself, not just in the text of the thesis and also possibly simplified way to manage (especially start) all the services together automatically.

4. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards   90 /100 (A)

The resulting solution needs some polishing and improvements, incl. improved documentation, but can already be used if needed and I can clearly imagine practical use for various kinds of draw competitions.

The overall evaluation   68 /100 (D)

The implementation is of good quality and practically usable, but the written part has multiple serious problems on the edge of defendability, making the overall recommended grade quite poor.

Questions for the defense

For future work - you mention distributed tracing: How could such thing be done? (briefly, no need to get into too much detail)

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.

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.