

Review report of a final thesis

Czech Technical University in Prague

Faculty of Information Technology

Student: Bc. Jaroslav Pouzar
Reviewer: Ing. Alexandru Moucha, Ph.D.
Thesis title: Vylepšení bezdrátové síťové infrastruktury
Branch of the study: Computer Systems and Networks (Master, in Czech and in English)

Date: 1. 6. 2015

<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 1 to 5.</i>
1. Difficulty and other comments on the assignment	<i>1 = extremely challenging assignment, 2 = rather difficult assignment, 3 = assignment of average difficulty, 4 = easier, but still sufficient assignment, 5 = insufficient assignment</i>
<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.)	
<i>Comments:</i> The diploma thesis is oriented to the analysis and further improvement of a Wifi (enterprise-like) network.	
<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.</i>
2. Fulfilment of the assignment	<i>1 = assignment fulfilled, 2 = assignment fulfilled with minor objections, 3 = assignment fulfilled with major objections, 4 = assignment not fulfilled</i>
<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.	
<i>Comments:</i> The work covers all the requirements.	
<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.</i>
3. Size of the main written part	<i>1 = meets the criteria, 2 = meets the criteria with minor objections, 3 = meets the criteria with major objections, 4 = does not meet the criteria</i>
<i>Criteria description:</i> Evaluate the adequacy of the extent of the final thesis, considering its content and the size of the written part, i.e. that all parts of the thesis are rich on information and the text does not contain unnecessary parts.	
<i>Comments:</i> The size of the work and its quality fulfil the requirements.	
<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i>
4. Factual and logical level of the thesis	<i>90 (A)</i>
<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.	
<i>Comments:</i> The work was performed logically, incrementally and it is very well documented.	
<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i>
5. Formal level of the thesis	<i>90 (A)</i>
<i>Criteria description:</i> Assess the correctness of formalisms used in the thesis, the typographical and linguistic aspects, see Dean's Directive No. 12/2014, Article 3.	
<i>Comments:</i> The work is very well written, easy to read and understand. It can be used as an internal documentation by the organisation in Ceske Budejovice.	
<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i>
6. Bibliography	<i>90 (A)</i>
<i>Criteria description:</i> 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.	
<i>Comments:</i> The student documented himself very thoroughly before doing this work.	
<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i>

7. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards

70 (C)

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 work has no scientific value though it was very important to the organisation (school) in Ceske Budejovice. Their network now performs not only better but it is also more secured.

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 use of this work is to the organisation (the school) in Ceske Budejovice.

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:

In the printed form the text has different shades of grey, sometimes it looks as if it is bold.

At the beginning of 1.2.1, the network topology could have been better augmented by an image / diagram.

Units of measurement are written in the ISO standard as 50 cm not 50cm.

What is IKT ? I could not find this in the text.

In paragraph 1.2.2 the sections should have been numbered for referencing (1.2.2.1, 1.2.2.2, etc).

In paragraph 1.2.3 the author wrote about the measurements without actually referencing to them. Only after reading the whole chapter the reader finds the measurements. Please include referencing.

Take care that "router on a stick" can become a bottleneck in the future.

On page 41 - "AAI" should have been introduced. The fact that I think it is Authentication and Authorisation Infrastructure is only at the latitude of the reader, not explained in the text.

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 work is a classic implementation of technology, without scientific purpose. However it is at the level required for an engineer and it was developed according to the guidelines for such a work.

Signature of the reviewer: