Review report of a final thesis

Czech Technical University in Prague   **Faculty of Information Technology**

Student:	Bc. Jan Bližničenko
Reviewer:	Dr. Serge Stinckwich
Thesis title:	Live Visualization of Epidemiological Models
Branch of the study:	Web and Software Engineering

Date: 23. 1. 2018

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 1 to 5.
1. Difficulty and other comments on the assignment	*1 = extremely challenging assignment,* ***2 = rather difficult assignment,*** *3 = assignment of average difficulty,* *4 = easier, but still sufficient assignment,* *5 = insufficient assignment*

Criteria description:
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.)

Comments:
The main difficulty in this thesis was the student need to know a little bit about the epidemiology in order to be able to understand how the composition of models works in this domain.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.
2. Fulfilment of the assignment	*1 = assignment fulfilled,* ***2 = assignment fulfilled with minor objections,*** *3 = assignment fulfilled with major objections,* *4 = assignment not fulfilled*

Criteria description:
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.

Comments:
The author of the thesis meets most of the assignment statements. A first prototype of a live visualization modelling tool in the context of epidemiology has been prototype. The only insufficiency is that the tool has not been assess by domain expert due to lack of time.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.
3. Size of the main written part	*1 = meets the criteria,* ***2 = meets the criteria with minor objections,*** *3 = meets the criteria with major objections,* *4 = does not meet the criteria*

Criteria description:
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.

Comments:
The size of the Msc Thesis is more than 60 pages and give a lot of details about the context of this research work. The chapter 3 about implementation give a lot of information but chapter 5 about Testing (only two pages) is very short and maybe should be integrated with Chapter 4.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
4. Factual and logical level of the thesis	*77 (C)*

Criteria description:
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.

Comments:
The logical structure of the thesis sounds good. My only concern is that the related part is very short and could be extended a little bit.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
5. Formal level of the thesis	*80 (B)*

Criteria description:
Assess the correctness of formalisms used in the thesis, the typographical and linguistic aspect s, see Dean's Directive No. 26/2017, Article 3.

Comments:
The document is well written and the english is easy to understand.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
6. Bibliography	*70 (C)*

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:
The choice of sources is relevant, but some references to modular modelling are maybe missing.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
7. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards	*80 (B)*

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:
This thesis resulted in a publication during IWST 2017: Proceedings of the 12th edition of the International Workshop on Smalltalk Technologies, IWST 2017, Maribor, Slovenia, September 4-8, 2017. ACM 2017, ISBN 978-1-4503-5554-4

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:
Even if the potential have need to described that much in the thesis, there could be a lot of impact in the context of computational science.

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:
Do you see other domains where your work might apply apply ?

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
10. The overall evaluation	*78 (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 student did a good job regarding the implementation but it would have been interesting to develop a little more theoretical aspects.

Signature of the reviewer: