

BACHELOR THESIS PEER REVIEW

I. PERSONAL AND STUDY DETAILS

Student's name: Radić Marina Personal ID number: 491765

Faculty: Faculty of Biomedical Engineering
Study program: Biomedical and Clinical Technology

Branch of study: **Biomedical Technician**

II. EVALUATION OF THE BACHELOR THESIS

Comparison of neonatal resuscitation systems				
	Evaluation criteria	N. of point		
1.	Fulfillment of the aim of the thesis and suitability of the structure of the thesis with respect to the topic (compliance with the assignment). $(0 - 30)$ *	25		
	Any part or sentence of the bachelor thesis assignment has to be dealt with. The full amount of points can be given to the excellent thesis only. The points are reduced in relation to the part of the assignment which is not properly dealt with or is not included at all.			
2.	Theoretical level and application of accessible sources. (0 – 30)*	20		
	The reader evaluates the relevance of the theoretical part of the thesis with respect to the assignment and structuring of the ideas. If word-for-word citing prevails, the reader shall decrease the rating by 15 points. (of course if copyright is abided). Moreover, another reason for decreasing the overall assessment is insufficient amount of theoretical knowledge, references and sources.			
3.	Scope of experimental work (SW, HW) and applied knowledge, quality of methodology and conclusions of the thesis. (0 - 30)*	20		
	Maximum number of points can be granted to a thesis which is fit for publishing. This aspect is judged with respect to enhancement of theoretical knowledge and practical implications. Creation of a model, SW or technical realization is valued. For minor methodological flaws, the assessment is reduced by up to 5 points. Inconsistency of elaboration with theoretical background and unclear or not fully professional approach leads to a reduction by at least 15 points. Another decrease can be due to insufficient discussion. A total of 30 points can be given to a very complex and flawless work, including other activities such as participation in scientific-research project or grant, active participation in the writing publications, patents and utility models.			
1.	Formal requisites and layout of the thesis (writing mastery, structuring, graphs, tables, citations in the text, list of references etc.). $(0 - 10)^*$	8		
	Reader evaluates formal requisites according to the rules of writing, attributes of final works, i.e. text formatting, structure of the text, references, quality of charts and tables and citations. Number of points can be reduced for noncompliance with the rules by the maximum of 2 points for each disrespected attribute. Grammatical mistakes, spelling mistakes and improper stylistics and terminology decrease the evaluation by 2-4 points. Only standard terminology should be used, especially in the English language (it is necessary to judge the ability to use the technical language - 2 points), graph are according to the rules (see tolerance and the influence of statistical processing - 2 points), captions are included for graphs and tables and everything is readable (2 points), citation rules are complied with according to ISO690 and ISO690-2 (2 points).			
5.	Total points	73		

III. PROPOSED QUESTIONS FOR THE DEFENSE (OPTIONAL)

1. How is the quality of neonatal car countries?	e assessed? How does Czech neo	onatal care compare to	other developed

2. What are the limits of your study?

3. Which of the two devices would you recommend using?

IV. THE OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE LEVEL OF THE BACHELOR THESIS

Grade**:	A (excellent)	B (very good)	C (good)	D (satisfactory)	E (sufficient)	F (failed)
Number of points:	100 - 90	89 - 80	79 - 70	69 - 60	59 - 50	< 50
			X			

^{**} in case of F (failed) please explain in detail

I give the above grade to the bachelor thesis and I recommend/do not recommend it for the defence.

V. COMMENTS

The thesis fulfills all criteria. Its length and depth suffice.

The theoretical part covers the studied devices sufficiently, the rest of the theoretical part is less apposite (e.g. resuscitation bag and endotracheal tube should be discussed more in connection with the studied topic). Also, the (very good) position of the Czech Republic in neonatal care should be mentioned.

The practical part covers the experiment sufficiently. However, the Discussion does not compare the findings of the thesis to other studies, as should be expected. Also, the limitation of the study (thesis) is completely missing. The conclusion should be more thorough.

References used cover the topic extensively, the number of them (45) exceeds the necessary amount.

Name and surname incl. degrees: doc. MUDr. Jan Bruthans, Ph.D.	Signature:
Institution: ČVUT v Praze, Fakulta biomedicínského inženýrství	
Contact address: Nám. Sítná 3105, 272 01 Kladno	Date: