THESIS REVIEWER'S REPORT

I. IDENTIFICATION DATA

Thesis title:	**Pog: A portable package manager for Windows**
Author's name:	**Matěj Kafka**
Type of thesis :	
Faculty/Institute:	
Department:	Department of Measurement
Thesis reviewer:	Josef Kokeš
Reviewer's department:	aculty of Information Technology, Department of Information Security

II. EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA

Assignment

How demanding was the assigned project?

The student set out to create a package manager for Windows that would perform better than competing package managers on several grounds. I consider that quite a challenging goal.

Fulfilment of assignment

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.

The stated goals were fulfilled. There is still a lot of work to be done, but that is well out of the scope of the thesis.

Methodology

Comment on the correctness of the approach and/or the solution methods.

The general approach seems correct for the current state of the project. I am not certain it is extensible enough to adapt easily to other distribution archives – for the moment, only packages extractable with 7-zip seem to be supported, but other common installer formats will need to be added in the future and that might prove challenging with the current layout.

Technical level

Is the thesis technically sound? How well did the student employ expertise in the field of his/her field of study? Does the student explain clearly what he/she has done?

The technical level of the work is excellent. The student performed the problem analysis well, set reasonable goals and implemented them correctly.

Formal and language level, scope of thesis

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?

For the most part, the thesis is well written. It has a logical structure and clearly explains the concepts and problems involved and their solution. It is not entirely complete – I missed some of the user-level documentation (e.g. how to search for available packages, that was only available in one of the readme files) as well as instructions for the potential package creators (some of that information can be found in Chapter 6, but not all of it). Some information only appears in the sources (in a difficult-to-navigate set of files and directories).

Selection of sources, citation correctness

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?

No problems here.

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.
I very much like the idea of the thesis. I did encounter some minor issues in various unexpected places. The compilation process (installation from sources) is either not described at all or I didn't find it in the sources. The binary installation (both online and from Github releases) fails to install the application if Pog is installed on a SUBSTed drive. That's to be expected in an application which hasn't been made public yet.

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

Summarize your opinion on the thesis and explain your final grading. Pose questions that should be answered during the presentation and defense of the student's work.

The grade that I award for the thesis is

Date: Signature: