**FACULTY
OF INFORMATION
TECHNOLOGY
CTU IN PRAGUE**

Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

Supervisor: Ing. Petr Máj
Student: Bc. Filip Gregor
Thesis title: Tiny86 Debugger
Branch / specialization: System Programming
Created on: 26 June 2023

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

Filip fulfilled the assignment perfectly, in fact the tool is already been test-driven by this years NI-GEN students.

2. Main written part   100 /100 (A)

The thesis is well written, mistakes are infrequent and the text reads well. The thesis gives a very detailed introduction to debugging on current platforms that came from the student himself and far exceeds the expectations I had for the part.

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

Overall, the deep understanding of the debugging principles demonstrated in the written part has shown itself again in the design of the debugger presented in the thesis. The design is clean, uncluttered and thoughtful. The command-line interface mimics current tools the students should be familiar with such as gdb in such way that it is easy to forget one is playing with a result of thesis.

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

The results have already been deployed in practice in the NI-GEN course. I expect the deployment only to grow as the course is being restructured towards language independent mode.

5. Activity of the student

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

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

Filip has excellent self-reliance and activity. So much so that our consultations were really just that:) Despite alternating periods of very little work being done, and lots of changes being made, Filip was never really lost or overwhelmed with work and produced at a steady pace in the long run. A testament to his abilities for self-management is that his thesis was finished weeks before the deadline.

The overall evaluation   100 /100 (A)

Given what has been said above, I am very pleased with the result of this thesis. I congratulate Filip on completing the tool to the high standards he set upon himself.

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.