



# Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

**Supervisor:** Ing. Milan Dojčinovski, Ph.D.  
**Student:** Bc. Ondřej Viskup  
**Thesis title:** System for Management of Personal Music Libraries using Knowledge Graphs Technology  
**Branch / specialization:** Web Engineering  
**Created on:** 4 June 2024

## 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

The student has fulfilled the assignment and developed a fully functional prototype.

### 2. Main written part 88<sub>/100</sub> (B)

Overall, the thesis is well structured. The individual chapters logically follow. The student has decided to write the thesis in English which is exceptional. The thesis is easy to read and follow. One minor issue is the clarity of particular parts, such as the motivations and thesis goals, and parts such as section 2.1 Music, which could be better elaborated and integrated in the thesis. However, these issues have no significant impact on the overall quality of the thesis.

### 3. Non-written part, attachments 100<sub>/100</sub> (A)

The student developed a functional prototype of a conceptual idea. The student managed to identify, get familiar and use relevant Semantic Web technologies. The system, although a prototype, is still of a high quality.

### 4. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards 92<sub>/100</sub> (A)

The developed system is in its current state a prototype which is not ready to be used in practice. Primarily, due to the relatively still not enough mature user interface. The user interface, however, was not in the focus of the thesis.

## 5. Activity of the student

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

The student has shown excellent activity. The student was always prepared for the consultation hours and always met the deadlines.

## 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

The student has shown excellent self-reliance in the implementation and writing phases.

## The overall evaluation

93 /100 (A)

The student successfully applied the knowledge acquired during the studies and managed to develop a fully functional prototype.

## **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.