



Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

Supervisor: Ing. Ondřej Guth, Ph.D.
Student: Arpan Tyagi
Thesis title: Application for booking beauty services
Branch / specialization: Software Engineering
Created on: 30 May 2023

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 assignment is fulfilled.

2. Main written part

94 /100 (A)

The thesis text is very good, correct, contains all necessary parts, its logical structure works well, and is comprehensible to the reader. The typographic and language aspect of the text is acceptable. Thus, I have no major objection.

Some minor issues follow:

- (language) p. 15, par. 1: "tries" → "try"
- (language) p. 15, section 4.1.1, par. 2: "applications" → "application"
- (typography) p. 16: a small overfull of the text into the right margin
- (language) p. 18, the last but 1 par.: "Kotlin" as the last word should be removed
- (typography) p. 18, the past par.: "experience.Furthermore" → "experience. Furthermore"
- (typo) p. 33, section 6.2.1.1, par. 2: "online, lf" → "online, if"
- (typography) p. 37, item 6: " → " (incorrect symbol for opening quotation mark)

3. Non-written part, attachments

100 /100 (A)

The implementation was demonstrated to me by the student and I have checked the sources during the development process. The application (both the Android client and the Kotlin server) fulfills the assignment and works without major issues.

4. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards

75 /100 (C)

The result of the work is a prototype. Moreover, the majority of the thesis focuses on customers without even discussing the needs of businesses. Thus, the implementation cannot be used by end users in its current state. However, it can be a base for a successful product.

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

94 /100 (A)

The thesis (both the text and implementation) fulfill the assignment. The result is very good and the student shown the ability of independently developing software.

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.