### Reviewer's form for thesis evaluation

#### 1. Identification of the student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student:</th>
<th>Montenegro Eduarte Juan Sebastian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thesis:</td>
<td>Design of prequalified European beam-to-column connections for moment resistant frames with component based finite element method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>ČVUT v Praze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic year:</td>
<td>2016/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2. Identification of the reviewer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>František Wald</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>ČVUT v Praze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position:</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3. Fulfilment of thesis goals

- excellent ☐
- above aver. ☒
- average ☐
- below aver. ☐
- weak ☐

**Comments:**
The work fulfil all the objectives.

#### 4. Academic/scientific/technical quality

- excellent ☐
- above aver. ☐
- average ☒
- below aver. ☐
- weak ☐

**Comments:**
The results are valuable. The final sensitivity study should be longer.

#### 5. Formal arrangement of the thesis and level of language

- excellent ☒
- above aver. ☐
- average ☒
- below aver. ☐
- weak ☐
Comments:
The theses are written well.

6. Further comments

The colleague worked very independently on rather difficult task.

7. Grade: C

Use the following scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A (excellent)</th>
<th>B (very good)</th>
<th>C (good)</th>
<th>D (satisfactory)</th>
<th>E (sufficient)</th>
<th>F (fail)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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