

## I. IDENTIFICATION DATA

<b>Thesis title:</b>	<b>Progressive web application for online psychotherapy</b>
<b>Author's name:</b>	<b>Kadyrova Selina</b>
<b>Type of thesis :</b>	bachelor
<b>Faculty/Institute:</b>	Faculty of Electrical Engineering (FEE)
<b>Department:</b>	Department of Computer Science
<b>Thesis reviewer:</b>	Kyrylo Bulat
<b>Reviewer's department:</b>	Department of Computer Science

## II. EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA

<b>Assignment</b> <i>How demanding was the assigned project?</i> Please insert your comments here.	<b>ordinarily challenging</b>
--	-------------------------------

<b>Fulfilment of assignment</b> <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>	<b>fulfilled with minor objections</b>
<p>The thesis fulfills the assigned task, covering all the required points. However, some areas could be further developed. The application design chapter deserves more attention - the student could describe the proposed class and deployment diagram in more detail.</p> <p>Even though the student performed testing using various techniques, the testing chapter would benefit from describing the testing scenarios and measurements collected during the testing, e.g., unit test coverage, number of bugs discovered, and number of test scenarios executed.</p> <p>On the positive side, the student excelled in implementing, documenting, and testing client and server-side applications, showcasing their technical proficiency.</p>	

<b>Activity and independence when creating final thesis</b> <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>	<b>B - very good.</b>
<p>The student demonstrated an adequate approach throughout the project, meeting most of the time limits. The student addressed the given suggestions proactively. The student showed an ability to work independently, taking the initiative to solve problems and address provided feedback.</p>	

<b>Technical level</b> <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>	<b>B - very good.</b>
<p>The student demonstrated an understanding of the technologies used and applied some of the best software development practices for implementing client- and server-side applications.</p> <p>The student could invest more time into the application design chapter by discovering other software architecture styles. The student could explain the class and deployment diagrams in more detail.</p> <p>I found a few places where the code could be improved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RecommendationAPI class does not add any value.</li> <li>• The unit tests in the back-end application contain duplications when creating test data.</li> </ul> <p>The student provided detailed documentation in the source code.</p>	

<b>Formal level and language level, scope of thesis</b> <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>	<b>C - good.</b>
<p>The written work is composed in clear English, making it easy to read.</p>	

I have noticed a few typos and inconsistencies in the thesis:

- Inconsistent usage of capital letters in the "Functional requirements" list.
- The terms "Layer" and "Tier" are used interchangeably when they are two different things.
- The implementation chapter mentions the development of the "Service layer," which is not discussed in the application architecture section,
- On pages 39 and 43, the code snippets go beyond the standard width of the page,
- The list's header and the list are split into two pages.

### Selection of sources, citation correctness

**B - very good.**

*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?*

The student performed research on the given problem and selected appropriate sources. Bibliographic citations are complete and informative. However, including more citations in the chapter discussing existing solutions would be beneficial.

### 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.*

Please insert your comments here.

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

The student worked independently and responsibly and demonstrated the ability to create and deploy a complete client-server system according to functional and non-functional specifications.

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

Date: **20.1.2024**

Signature: *Kyrylo Bulat*