

SpaceMaster Diploma Thesis Review **- supervisor -**

Name of student: Sharathkumaar Mohanasundaram

Thesis topic: Design and simulation of satellite attitude stabilization control laws

CTU Supervisor: Doc. Ing. Martin Hromčík, Ph.D., DCE FEE CTU in Prague

Sharathkumaar is a Round 9 SpaceMaster student at CVUT. His diploma project was assigned in February 2015. The goal was to create a set of appealing simulation examples that I would use in the lectures and labs of the courses Space Engineering and Flight Control Systems.

The thesis submitted in Spring 2016 was rejected by the State Examination Committee with a recommendation to elaborate it and re-write the manuscript.

Now my evaluation of the revised version follows, based on the concerns I raised related to the first submission. Let me recapitulate my remarks I made a year ago, and let us see how those concerns of mine have been addressed in the resubmitted version.

Remark 1 from review of Version 1:

“During the year and a half work on the assignment, the student delivered a set of rudimentary simulation examples adopted from the textbook by Bryson. This itself would be OK as a starting point – and it was indeed my recommendation in Winter 2014 to start with this book. However, there are no further steps made that I assumed, like fitting the simulation models parameters to existing space projects and missions, combining the functionalities of the control subsystems in complex models, consider couplings effects.”

What changed / got improved with Version 2:

I cannot see any substantial change. There are still no realistic models presented, no complex tasks / combining functionalities attempts have been made and none are reported.

Remark 2 from review of Version 1:

“This is a result of the student’s approach to consultations and cooperation with me as a supervisor. There was not a single one technical consultation realized during the whole course of the project. I had virtually no possibility to express my views on the results and planned steps, the fact that Sharatkumaar actually submitted the thesis this Summer came as a big surprise to me.”

What changed / got improved with Version 2:

Nothing. Virtually nothing.

Remark 2 from review of Version 1:

“Specific critical comments: No discussion of results, no assessment, no discussions of alternative approaches – this is completely missing. ...”

What changed / got improved with Version 2:

Nothing.

Based on the above arguments, my suggestion remains the same:

grade E

in accordance to ECTS.

2017/09/06

Date

Signature