



Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

Supervisor: prof. Ing. Pavel Tvrđík, CSc.
Student: Kirill Rybakov
Thesis title: Logik desktop application
Branch / specialization: Software Engineering 2021
Created on: 12 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 fulfilled all the requirements of the thesis assignment. The result is a fully functional platform-independent MasterMind desktop application, with a few implemented functionalities in addition to those requested.

2. Main written part 95 /100 (A)

The written part of the thesis consists of an extensive analysis of existing implementations, of a description of functional and non-functional requirements and of a description of use case analysis. This preparatory work resulted in a design described in Chapter 2 and implementation in Unity and C# described in Chapter 3. This chapter also describes the performed testing. I can therefore conclude that the thesis satisfies all requirements set for a bachelor thesis.

3. Non-written part, attachments 95 /100 (A)

The quality of the SW and the documentation seems to be carefully set up, the choice of specific programming technologies was always discussed with me.

4. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards 95 /100 (A)

The resulting application is fully functional, the source code is fully documented and available on FIT's gitlab, the repository generates code for both Linux and Windows systems.

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

The overall evaluation

95 /100 (A)

Both the resulting software and the written text fulfill all the requirements imposed on a bachelor thesis.

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.