

I. IDENTIFICATION DATA

Thesis title:	Debugging API for semantic pipelines
Author's name:	Grishchenko Miron
Type of thesis :	bachelor
Faculty/Institute:	Faculty of Electrical Engineering (FEE)
Department:	Department of Computer Science
Thesis reviewer:	Ing. Karel Frajták, PhD.
Reviewer's department:	Software Testing Intelligence Lab

II. EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA

Assignment	challenging
The assigned project is quite challenging. Author notes that he had to master completely new topics (semantic web, ontologies, etc.) and extend an already existing project with new functionality.	

Fulfilment of assignment	fulfilled with major objections
The assignment was fulfilled, but the result is not adequately presented in the thesis. The author had added debugging functionality to s-pipes project, which passed user testing, but the reader of the thesis is kept in the dark. The debugger in this stage does not have a user interface, the debugging information (or execution metrics and logs) are included in REST endpoint responses. This key aspect of the solution is nowhere to be found in the text. The reader cannot evaluate the author's contribution in the area and how it improves the s-pipes debugging experience. The required module was supposed to collect data about the execution, but the thesis is missing section discussing possible solutions to this problem (I guess some similarities can be found in CI pipelines).	

Methodology	correct
Chosen approach is correct – author describes the topics, the analysis and implementation details.	

Technical level	B - very good.
The author employes expertise in his field. It is clearly explained what was done.	

Formal and language level, scope of thesis	B - very good.
The thesis is logically organized. The English is satisfactory with some grammar mistakes, which is understandable since author is not native speaker.	

Selection of sources, citation correctness	B - very good.
The author selected a number of resources to cite in his work. Many of them are online resources which I would rather see as footnotes. Citations are meeting the standards.	

Additional commentary and evaluation (optional)
<i>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.</i>
Please insert your comments here.

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

The author has done tremendous work, but the results are not well presented. If this is addressed during the presentation, the grade can be improved.



THESIS REVIEWER'S REPORT

Questions for the student:

1. Are the queries on page 36 protected from injection attacks?
2. The debugging module is collecting some metrics and insights into the pipeline execution. Does it collect logs from the execution too? How would this problem be approached?

The grade that I award for the thesis is **C - good**.

Date: **10.6.2023**

Signature: