

I. IDENTIFICATION DATA

Thesis title:	Methods for obtaining reliable phase-gradient delays from otoacoustic emission data
Author's name:	Josef Havlas
Type of thesis :	bachelor
Faculty/Institute:	Faculty of Electrical Engineering (FEE)
Department:	Department of Circuit Theory
Thesis reviewer:	Václav Vencovský, Ph.D.
Reviewer's department:	Department of Radioelectronics

II. EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA

Assignment	challenging
<i>How demanding was the assigned project?</i>	

Fulfilment of assignment	fulfilled
<i>How well does the thesis fulfil the assigned task? Have the primary goals been achieved? Which assigned tasks have been incompletely covered, and which parts of the thesis are overextended? Justify your answer.</i>	

Activity and independence when creating final thesis	A - excellent.
<i>Assess whether the student had a positive approach, whether the time limits were met, whether the conception was regularly consulted and whether the student was well prepared for the consultations. Assess the student's ability to work independently.</i>	
The student actively worked on the thesis during the entire semester. We were discussing his work mostly online because he had study internship in Canada. Despite that, he successfully finished the thesis.	

Technical level	A - excellent.
<i>Is the thesis technically sound? How well did the student employ expertise in his/her field of study? Does the student explain clearly what he/she has done?</i>	
The reviewer can answer more appropriately.	

Formal level and language level, scope of thesis	B - very good.
<i>Are formalisms and notations used properly? Is the thesis organized in a logical way? Is the thesis sufficiently extensive? Is the thesis well-presented? Is the language clear and understandable? Is the English satisfactory?</i>	
Again, a question for the reviewer. I gave B because the text could be still improved. On the other hand, it is a bachelor thesis and the author is not an English native speaker.	

Selection of sources, citation correctness	A - excellent.
<i>Does the thesis make adequate reference to earlier work on the topic? Was the selection of sources adequate? Is the student's original work clearly distinguished from earlier work in the field? Do the bibliographic citations meet the standards?</i>	
Again, a question more appropriate for the reviewer. The student was given most of the citations and I feel that he clearly distinguished his contribution.	

Additional commentary and evaluation (optional)

Comment on the overall quality of the thesis, its novelty and its impact on the field, its strengths and weaknesses, the utility of the solution that is presented, the theoretical/formal level, the student's skillfulness, etc.

See below.

III. OVERALL EVALUATION, QUESTIONS FOR THE PRESENTATION AND DEFENSE OF THE THESIS, SUGGESTED GRADE

Summarize your opinion on the thesis and explain your final grading.

Josef started working on the topic of his bachelor thesis during his semestral project in the fall semester 2022. He was able to quickly orient in the topic and learn the needed theory. In January 2023, Josef went to Canada for his study internship. Therefore, we were collaborating on his thesis remotely. Despite that, we had regular online meetings and Josef actively worked on his thesis the entire semester. In his thesis, Josef implemented and verified basic methods for analysis of reflection source otoacoustic emissions. It is the first work known to me, which assessed the methods using nonlinear cochlear model for various level of stimuli. We plan to use the methods in our research.

The grade that I award for the thesis is **A - excellent**.

Date: 5.6.2023

Signature: