

# Review report of a final thesis

Czech Technical University in Prague

Faculty of Information Technology

**Student:** Jaroslav Bambas  
**Reviewer:** Mgr. Martin Podloucký  
**Thesis title:** Validation of Process Diagrams in BORM Method  
**Branch of the study:** Information Systems and Management (Bachelor, in Czech))

**Date:** 27. 5. 2015

<p><i>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p><b>1. Difficulty and other comments on the assignment</b></p>	<p><i>The evaluation scale: 1 to 5.</i></p> <p>1 = extremely challenging assignment, <b>2 = rather difficult assignment,</b> 3 = assignment of average difficulty, 4 = easier, but still sufficient assignment, 5 = insufficient assignment</p>
<p><i>Criteria description:</i> Characterize this final thesis in detail and its relationships to previous or current projects. Comment what is difficult about this thesis (in case of a more difficult thesis, you may overlook some shortcomings that you would not in case of an easy assignment, and on the contrary, with an easy assignment those shortcomings should be evaluated more strictly.)</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> I found the assignment more demanding since it requires not only a deep understanding of the BORM method but there is also a significant effort needed to uncover all the possible problems that could appear in the general case of the BORM process diagram.</p>	
<p><i>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p><b>2. Fulfilment of the assignment</b></p>	<p><i>The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.</i></p> <p><b>1 = assignment fulfilled,</b> 2 = assignment fulfilled with minor objections, 3 = assignment fulfilled with major objections, 4 = assignment not fulfilled</p>
<p><i>Criteria description:</i> Assess whether the thesis meets the assignment statement. In Comments indicate parts of the assignment that have not been fulfilled, completely or partially, or extensions of the thesis beyond the original assignment. If the assignment was not completely fulfilled, try to assess the importance, impact, and possibly also the reason of the insufficiencies.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> --</p>	
<p><i>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p><b>3. Size of the main written part</b></p>	<p><i>The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.</i></p> <p><b>1 = meets the criteria,</b> 2 = meets the criteria with minor objections, 3 = meets the criteria with major objections, 4 = does not meet the criteria</p>
<p><i>Criteria description:</i> Compare the size of the written part with the expected size (without appendices), see the Dean's Directive No. 9/2011, Article 3. To evaluate the thesis it is also important that all parts of the written part are rich on information and necessary for a final thesis. The text should not contain unnecessary parts.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> --</p>	
<p><i>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p><b>4. Factual and logical level of the thesis</b></p>	<p><i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i></p> <p>90 (A)</p>
<p><i>Criteria description:</i> Assess whether the thesis is correct as to the facts or if there are factual errors and inaccuracies. Evaluate further the logical structure of the thesis, links among the chapters, and the comprehensibility of the text for a reader.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The logical structure of the thesis is very good. All the ideas are presented very clearly. I especially value that, throughout the thesis, there are many pictures which considerably help to understand the ideas behind the text.</p>	
<p><i>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p><b>5. Formal level of the thesis</b></p>	<p><i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i></p> <p>65 (D)</p>
<p><i>Criteria description:</i> Assess the correctness of formalisms used in the thesis, the typographical and linguistic aspects, see Dean's Directive No. 9/2011, Article 3.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> Unfortunately, what the thesis gains with its clarity and good logical structure, it loses with its poor English. Many sentences throughout the whole paper have issues with the order of words, in some cases to such an extent it is difficult to understand what the author is trying to communicate. I suspect, that the text was written in some haste and hurry, and the author did not grant himself enough time to give the text some final proof-reading.</p>	
<p><i>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p><b>6. Bibliography</b></p>	<p><i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i></p> <p>70 (C)</p>

*Criteria description:*

Evaluate the student's activity in acquisition and use of studying materials in his thesis. Characterize the choice of the sources. Discuss whether the student used all relevant sources, or whether he tried to solve problems that were already solved. Verify that all elements taken from other sources are properly differentiated from his own results and contributions. Comment if there was a possible violation of the citation ethics and if the bibliographical references are complete and in compliance with citation standards.

*Comments:*

I would like to see more citations in the Introduction where there are several claims made without any support in the references.

*Evaluation criterion:*

*The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).*

**7. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards**

90 (A)

*Criteria description:*

Comment on the achieved level of major results of the thesis and indicate whether the main results of the thesis extend published state-of-the-art results and/or bring completely new findings. Assess the quality and functionality of hardware or software solutions. Alternatively, evaluate whether the software or source code that was not created by the student himself was used in accordance with the license terms and copyright. Comment on possible publication output or awards related to the thesis.

*Comments:*

The result of the thesis is a set of algorithms for a validation of process diagrams in BORM. The theoretical part is very well done and shows that the author really made an effort to understand BORM in all its details and pitfalls.

*Evaluation criterion:*

*No evaluation scale.*

**8. Applicability of the results**

*Criteria description:*

Indicate the potential of using the results of the thesis in practice.

*Comments:*

The author developed new algorithms for validation of BORM process diagrams. These algorithms are very valuable not only as a part of the modelling software for BORM, but also in the research concerning BORM, since they uncover many possible mistakes a user can make when creating process models.

*Evaluation criterion:*

*No evaluation scale.*

**9. Questions for the defence**

*Criteria description:*

Formulate any question(s) that the student should answer to the committee during the defence (use a bullet list).

*Questions:*

1. Let us assume the set of all possible errors a user can make in a diagram. Can you assess what portion of this set are your algorithms able to detect?

*Evaluation criterion:*

*The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).*

**10. The overall evaluation**

79 (C)

*Criteria description:*

Summarize the parts of the thesis that had major impact on your evaluation. The overall evaluation **does not** have to be the arithmetic mean or any other formula with the values from the previous evaluation criteria 1 to 9.

*Comments:*

The thesis makes a substantial contribution to the development of BORM. Its quality is unfortunately brought down by its use of English. So the proposed final mark is C. However, I am still inclined towards B and leave the final decision to the defense commission, which might want to be more benevolent than I am in the case of the English language.

Signature of the reviewer: