## Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

## Czech Technical University in Prague

## Faculty of Information Technology

Student:	Šimon Hrabec
Supervisor:	Patrick Sanan, Ph.D.
Thesis title: Branch of the study:	Multi-level, Parallel Algorithms for Shape Interpolation on Modern Architectures Computer Science

## Date: 9. 1. 2018

1. Difficulty and other comments on the assignment. <u>1 = extremely challenging assignment.</u> 3 = ossign control of version description:          Critical description:          Character difficulty assignment.          Critical description:          Character difficulty and the index of the evaluation and its relationships to previous or carrier projects. Comments what a difficult doors this thesis for eacy of a new difficult these, you a version of the evaluation and implementing and extending algorithms in multiple environments/languages.          This was a very challenging assignment. It involved reviewing and comprehending research-level literature on shape interpolation and implementing and extending algorithms in multiple environments/languages.          Evaluation criterion:          The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.          2. Fulfilment of the assignment <u>1 = essignment fulfilled</u> 2 = assignment fulfilled with minor objections,         3 = assignment is the assignment was not completely fulfilled,         1 = meets the criteria,          Contraine description:          The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.          2 = mother different due with minor objections,         3 = assignment in due with minor objections,         3 = assignment in the insufficient          Contraine description:          The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.	Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 1 to 5.
Characterise this final thesis in detail and its relationships to previous or current projects. Comment what is difficult about this tess (in case of a many assignment, and on the contrary, with an easy assignment those shortcomings should be evaluated in stratedy). Comments: This was a very challenging assignment. It involved reviewing and comprehending research-level literature on shape interpolation and implementing and extending algorithms in multiple environments/languages. Fuluation criterion: The evaluation scale: 1 to 4. The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to f). The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to f). The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to f). The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to f). The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to f). The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (gr	on the assignment	2 = rather difficult assignment, 3 = assignment of average difficulty, 4 = easier, but still sufficient assignment,
This was a very challenging assignment. It involved reviewing and comprehending research-level literature on shape interpolation and implementing and extending algorithms in multiple environments/languages. Evolution activeria: The evoluation scale: 1 to 4 <b>1 = assignment fulfilled</b> <i>2 = assignment fulfilled</i> with minor objections, <i>3 = assignment fulfilled</i> with minor objections, <i>4 = assignment fulfilled</i> with minor objections, <i>4 = assignment fulfilled</i> with minor objections, <i>3 = assignment fulfilled</i> with minor objections, <i>3 = assignment fulfilled</i> with mojor objections, <i>3 = messignment fulfilled</i> and possibly also the reason of the insufficient Comments: The assignment statement has been satisfied. Evoluation active: 1 to 4. <b>1 = meets the</b> criteria with mojor objections, <i>3 = meets</i> the criteria Comments: The main written part is perhaps on the short side, but does meet all the criteria. Evoluation criterion: The evoluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). <b>5 Cottal description:</b> Comments: The review of the relevant background is clear and nicely sets up the problem to be solved computationally. It is very clear what algorithms were chosen and which software tools were used to implement	Characterize this final thesis in detail and its relationships to previous or current projects. Comm overlook some shortcomings that you would not in case of an easy assignment, and on the co	
interpolation and implementing and extending algorithms in multiple environments/languages.         Evaluation actienton:       The evaluation socie: 1: to 4.         2.       Fulfilment of the assignment       1 = assignment fulfilled, 2 = assignment fulfilled with major objections, 3 = assignment fulfilled with major objections, 4 = assignment fulfilled with major objections, 4 = assignment to the insufficience         Criteria description: Acties with head the asignment statement. In comments indicate parts of the assignment that have not been fulfilled, compately or partially, or extension Acties with head the asignment statement has been satisfied.         Evaluation actie: 10       The evaluation scale: 1: to 4.         3.       Size of the main written part       1 = meets the criteria 2 = meets the criteria         Criteria description: Activation actie: 10: 4       2 = ancets the criteria with minor objections, 3 = meets the criteria         Criteria description: Criteria description: Evaluate the adequase 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 to des not contain unereassary parts.         Comments: The main written part is perhaps on the short side, but does meet all the criteria.         Evaluation criterion: Evaluation criterion: The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).         4.       Factual and logical level of the thesis         Criteria description: Evaluation criterion: The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).         Criteria description: Section descript	Comments:	
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 completely or partally, or extendant 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 insufficienc Comments:         The assignment statement has been satisfied.       The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.         Evaluation criterion:       The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.         3. Size of the main written part       1 = meets the criteria, 2 = meets the criteria, 3 = meets the criteria with minor objections, 3 = meets the criteria with minor objections, 3 = meets the criteria with minor objections, 4 = does not meet the criteria         Comments:       The evaluation scale: 2 to 100 points (grade A to F).         Omments:       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).         Po (A)       The review of the relevant background is clear and nicely sets up the problem to be solved computationally. It is very clear what algorithms were chosen and which software tools were used to implement them. The chapter structure is good and the reader:         Evaluation criterion:       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).         90 (A)       1         Evaluation criterion:       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).         90 (A)       1         The review of the relevant backgr		
2. Fulfilment of the assignment       1 = assignment fulfilled, 2 = assignment fulfilled with major objections, 3 = assignment fulfilled with major objections, 4 = assignment not fulfilled         Citerio description:       Assess whether the thesis meets the assignment statement. In Comments indicate parts of the assignment that have not been fulfilled, comparising or partially, or extensions the thesis beginned the original assignment. If the assignment was not completely fulfilled, try to assess the importance, impact, and possibly also the reason of the insufficient Comments:         The assignment statement has been satisfied.       The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.         Evaluation criterion:       The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.         3. Size of the main written part       1 = meets the criteria, 2 = meets the criteria with major objections, 3 = meets the criteria with major objections, 4 = does not meet the criteria         Citeria description: Focilate the adequary parts.       The evaluation scale: 2 to 100 points (grade A to F).         Comments: The main written part is perhaps on the short side, but does meet all the criteria.       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).         90 (A)       90 (A)         Cheria description: For a reader.       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).         90 (A)       90 (A)         Cheria description: For a reader.       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).         90 (A)       1         Evaluation criterion: The review of the relevant background is clear and nicely sets up	interpolation and implementing and extending algorithms in multiple	
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 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 insufficient Comments:         The assignment statement has been satisfied.         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 minor objections, 3 = meets the criteria with minor objections, 4 = does not meet the criteria         Criteria description:       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).         Comments:       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).         The main written part is perhaps on the short side, but does meet all the criteria.       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).         4. Factual and logical level of the thesis       90 (A)       Criteria description:         X-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, a the comprehensibility of the test or a reader.         Comments:       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).         5. Formal		
Assess whether the thesis meets the assignment statement. In Comments indicate parts of the assignment that have not been fulfilled, completely valitiled, try to assess the importance, impact, and possibly also the reason of the insufficience Comments: The assignment statement has been satisfied. Evaluation criterion: The evaluation scale: 1 to 4. The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). The asis multiple of the thesis correct as to the facts or if there are factual errors and inaccuracies. Evaluate the description: The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (gr	-	2 = assignment fulfilled with minor objections, 3 = assignment fulfilled with major objections,
The assignment statement has been satisfied.         Evaluation criterion:       The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.         3. Size of the main written part       1 = meets the criteria, 2 = 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:       4 = does not meet the criteria         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 to does not contain unnecessary parts.         Comments:       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). <b>9</b> (A)       90 (A)         Criteria description:       The evaluate further the logical structure of the thesis, links among the chapters, a the comprehensibility of the text for a reader.         Comments:       Criteria description:         A. Factual and logical level of the the are factual errors and inaccuracies. Evaluate further the logical structure of the thesis, links among the chapters, a the comprehensibility of the text for a reader.         Comments:       The revoluction scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).         The review of the relevant background is clear and nicely sets up the problem to be solved computationally. It is very clear what algorithms were chosen and which software tools were used to implement them. The chapter structure is good and the readuction scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).         S. Formal level of the thesis, the typographical and linguistic aspect s, see De	Assess whether the thesis meets the assignment statement. In Comments indicate parts of the a the thesis beyond the original assignment. If the assignment was not completely fulfilled, try to a	
Evaluation criterion:       The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.         3. Size of the main written part		
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:          Facluate 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 to does not criteria          Comments:          The main written part is perhaps on the short side, but does meet all the criteria.          Fuduation criterion:          The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).          Pol (A)          Criteria description:          A. Factual and logical level of the thesis           90 (A)          A. Factual and logical level of the thesis           90 (A)          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, at the comprehensibility of the text for a reader.          Comments:          The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).          Pha review of the relevant background is clear and nicely sets up the problem to be solved computationally. It is very clear what algorithms were chosen and which software tools were used to implement them. The chapter structure is good and the reader can easily follow the exposition.          Evaluation cr		
Z = 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 to does not contain unnecessary parts.         Comments: The main written part is perhaps on the short side, but does meet all the criteria.         Evaluation criterion: The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). <b>4.</b> Factual and logical level of the thesis         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, a the comprehensibility of the text for a reader.         Comments: The review of the relevant background is clear and nicely sets up the problem to be solved computationally. It is very clear what algorithms were chosen and which software tools were used to implement them. The chapter structure is good and the reader can easily follow the exposition.         Evaluation criterion: The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). <b>5.</b> Formal level of the thesis forments: Masses whether correctness of formalisms used in the thesis, the typographical and linguistic aspect s, see Dean's Directive No. 26/2017, Article 3.         Comments: Evaluation criterion: There are many minor usage errors, typos, and instances of sloppy formatting. The overall presentation is logical and clear, however, and use of both mathematical and software-related terms is clear. Illustrations and code snippets could use a bit more effort or be extended, and		
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 to dees not contain unnecessary parts.         Comments:         The main written part is perhaps on the short side, but does meet all the criteria.         Evaluation criterion:       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). <b>4.</b> Factual and logical level of the thesis       90 (A)         Criteria description:       Sesses 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, a the comprehensibility of the text for a reader.         Comments:       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).         The review of the relevant background is clear and nicely sets up the problem to be solved computationally. It is very clear what algorithms were chosen and which software tools were used to implement them. The chapter structure is good and the reader can easily follow the exposition.         Evaluation criterion:       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). <b>5.</b> Formal level of the thesis.       70 (C)         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 evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). <b>5.</b> Formal level of the thesis	3. Size of the main written part	2 = meets the criteria with minor objections,
Evaluate the ådequacy of the extend 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 to does not contain unnecessary parts.         Comments:         The main written part is perhaps on the short side, but does meet all the criteria.         Evaluation criterion:       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). <b>4.</b> Factual and logical level of the thesis       90 (A)         Seeses 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, at the comprehensibility of the text for a reader.         Comments:       The review of the relevant background is clear and nicely sets up the problem to be solved computationally. It is very clear what algorithms were chosen and which software tools were used to implement them. The chapter structure is good and the readuation criterion:         Evaluation criterion:       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).         5. Formal level of the thesis       70 (C)         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:       There are many minor usage errors, typos, and instances of sloppy formatting. The overall presentation is logical and clear, however, and use of both mathematical and software-related terms is clear. Illustrations and code snippets could use a bit more effort or be extended, and tables are not very thorough.		4 = does not meet the criteria
The main written part is perhaps on the short side, but does meet all the criteria.         Evaluation criterion:       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). <b>4.</b> Factual and logical level of the thesis       90 (A)         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, at the comprehensibility of the text for a reader.         Comments:       Comments:         The review of the relevant background is clear and nicely sets up the problem to be solved computationally. It is very clear what algorithms were chosen and which software tools were used to implement them. The chapter structure is good and the reader can easily follow the exposition.         Evaluation criterion:       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). <b>5.</b> Formal level of the thesis, the typographical and linguistic aspect s, see Dean's Directive No. 26/2017, Article 3.         Comments:       There are many minor usage errors, typos, and instances of sloppy formatting. The overall presentation is logical and clear, however, and use of both mathematical and software-related terms is clear. Illustrations and code snippets could use a bit more effort or be extended, and tables are not very thorough.         Evaluation criterion:       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).	Evaluate the adequacy of the extent of the final thesis, considering its content and the size of the	e written part, i.e. that all parts of the thesis are rich on information and the text
Evaluation criterion:       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). <b>4.</b> Factual and logical level of the thesis       90 (A)         Criteria description:       PO (A)         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, a the comprehensibility of the text for a reader.         Comments:       Comments:         The review of the relevant background is clear and nicely sets up the problem to be solved computationally. It is very clear what algorithms were chosen and which software tools were used to implement them. The chapter structure is good and the reader can easily follow the exposition.         Evaluation criterion:       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). <b>5.</b> Formal level of the thesis       The thesis of formalisms used in the thesis, the typographical and linguistic aspect s, see Dean's Directive No. 26/2017, Article 3.         Comments:       There are many minor usage errors, typos, and instances of sloppy formatting. The overall presentation is logical and clear, however, and use of both mathematical and software-related terms is clear. Illustrations and code snippets could use a bit more effort or be extended, and tables are not very thorough.         Evaluation criterion:       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).	Comments:	
4. Factual and logical level of the thesis       90 (A)         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, at the comprehensibility of the text for a reader.         Comments:         The review of the relevant background is clear and nicely sets up the problem to be solved computationally. It is very clear what algorithms were chosen and which software tools were used to implement them. The chapter structure is good and the reader can easily follow the exposition.         Evaluation criterion:       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).         5. Formal level of the thesis, the typographical and linguistic aspect s, see Dean's Directive No. 26/2017, Article 3.         Comments:         There are many minor usage errors, typos, and instances of sloppy formatting. The overall presentation is logical and clear, however, and use of both mathematical and software-related terms is clear. Illustrations and code snippets could use a bit more effort or be extended, and tables are not very thorough.         Evaluation criterion:       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).	The main written part is perhaps on the short side, but does meet all	I the criteria.
thesis         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, a the comprehensibility of the text for a reader.         Comments:         The review of the relevant background is clear and nicely sets up the problem to be solved computationally. It is very clear what algorithms were chosen and which software tools were used to implement them. The chapter structure is good and the reader can easily follow the exposition.         Evaluation criterion:       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).         5. Formal level of the thesis       70 (C)         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:       There are many minor usage errors, typos, and instances of sloppy formatting. The overall presentation is logical and clear, however, and use of both mathematical and software-related terms is clear. Illustrations and code snippets could use a bit more effort or be extended, and tables are not very thorough.         Evaluation criterion:       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).	Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
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, a the comprehensibility of the text for a reader. Comments: The review of the relevant background is clear and nicely sets up the problem to be solved computationally. It is very clear what algorithms were chosen and which software tools were used to implement them. The chapter structure is good and the reader can easily follow the exposition. Evaluation criterion: The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). S. Formal level of the thesis, the typographical and linguistic aspect s, see Dean's Directive No. 26/2017, Article 3. Comments: There are many minor usage errors, typos, and instances of sloppy formatting. The overall presentation is logical and clear, however, and use of both mathematical and software-related terms is clear. Illustrations and code snippets could use a bit more effort or be extended, and tables are not very thorough. Evaluation criterion: The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).		90 (A)
The review of the relevant background is clear and nicely sets up the problem to be solved computationally. It is very clear what algorithms were chosen and which software tools were used to implement them. The chapter structure is good and the reader can easily follow the exposition.         Evaluation criterion:       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).         5. Formal level of the thesis       70 (C)         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:       There are many minor usage errors, typos, and instances of sloppy formatting. The overall presentation is logical and clear, however, and use of both mathematical and software-related terms is clear. Illustrations and code snippets could use a bit more effort or be extended, and tables are not very thorough.         Evaluation criterion:       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).	Assess whether the thesis is correct as to the facts or if there are factual errors and inaccuracies. I	Evaluate further the logical structure of the thesis, links among the chapters, and
what algorithms were chosen and which software tools were used to implement them. The chapter structure is good and the reader can easily follow the exposition.         Evaluation criterion:       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).         5. Formal level of the thesis       70 (C)         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:       There are many minor usage errors, typos, and instances of sloppy formatting. The overall presentation is logical and clear, however, and use of both mathematical and software-related terms is clear. Illustrations and code snippets could use a bit more effort or be extended, and tables are not very thorough.         Evaluation criterion:       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).		
reader can easily follow the exposition.         Evaluation criterion:       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).         5. Formal level of the thesis       70 (C)         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:       There are many minor usage errors, typos, and instances of sloppy formatting. The overall presentation is logical and clear, however, and use of both mathematical and software-related terms is clear. Illustrations and code snippets could use a bit more effort or be extended, and tables are not very thorough.         Evaluation criterion:       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).		
Evaluation criterion:       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). <b>5.</b> Formal level of the thesis       70 (C)         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:       There are many minor usage errors, typos, and instances of sloppy formatting. The overall presentation is logical and clear, however, and use of both mathematical and software-related terms is clear. Illustrations and code snippets could use a bit more effort or be extended, and tables are not very thorough.         Evaluation criterion:       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).		) implement them. The chapter structure is good and the
5. Formal level of the thesis70 (C)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: There are many minor usage errors, typos, and instances of sloppy formatting. The overall presentation is logical and clear, however, and use of both mathematical and software-related terms is clear. Illustrations and code snippets could use a bit more effort or be extended, and tables are not very thorough.Evaluation criterion:The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).		
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: There are many minor usage errors, typos, and instances of sloppy formatting. The overall presentation is logical and clear, however, and use of both mathematical and software-related terms is clear. Illustrations and code snippets could use a bit more effort or be extended, and tables are not very thorough. Evaluation criterion: The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).		
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: There are many minor usage errors, typos, and instances of sloppy formatting. The overall presentation is logical and clear, however, and use of both mathematical and software-related terms is clear. Illustrations and code snippets could use a bit more effort or be extended, and tables are not very thorough. Evaluation criterion: The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).		70 (C)
There are many minor usage errors, typos, and instances of sloppy formatting. The overall presentation is logical and clear, however, and use of both mathematical and software-related terms is clear. Illustrations and code snippets could use a bit more effort or be extended, and tables are not very thorough.         Evaluation criterion:       The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).	Assess the correctness of formalisms used in the thesis, the typographical and linguistic aspect s, s	ee Dean's Directive No. 26/2017, Article 3.
more effort or be extended, and tables are not very thorough.Evaluation criterion:The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).	There are many minor usage errors, typos, and instances of sloppy for	
Evaluation criterion:The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).	however, and use of both mathematical and software-related terms	is clear. Illustrations and code snippets could use a bit
	more effort or be extended, and tables are not very thorough.	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (arade A to F).

Criteria description			
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 references is good, extending those provided to include additional relevant works. Attention was paid to			
reference existing multi-level approaches. Formatting and completeness of entries is somewhat inconsistent. Good effort is			
made to cite both literature and software. Citation ethics are followed.			
Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).		
7. Evaluation of results,	70 (C)		
publication outputs and awards	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
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 results are interesting and promising but would require significant experience of the second second second	xtension and better presentation to provide a useful		
publication. Additional scaling studies (and better presentation of the res			
adding a multi-level approach in a GPGPU-enabled environment, which v			
methods in the sorts of real-time mobile environments mentioned in the			
used appropriately and admirably coupled into the environments used to	• .		
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:			
There is great possibility for using these results in practice, once they are	5		
practical performance of working, realtime, hardware-accelerated imple	mentations of shape interpolation algorithms is an		
important step in bringing them into usage in the market.			
Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 1 to 5.		
	9a:		
Evaluation criterion:	9a: 1 = excellent activity,		
Evaluation criterion: 9. Activity and self-reliance of the	9a: 1 = excellent activity, 2 = very good activity,		
Evaluation criterion: 9. Activity and self-reliance of the	9a: 1 = excellent activity, 2 = very good activity, <b>3 = average activity,</b>		
Evaluation criterion: 9. Activity and self-reliance of the	9a: 1 = excellent activity, 2 = very good activity, <b>3 = average activity,</b> 4 = weaker, but still sufficient activity,		
Evaluation criterion: 9. Activity and self-reliance of the	9a: 1 = excellent activity, 2 = very good activity, <b>3 = average activity,</b> 4 = weaker, but still sufficient activity, 5 = insufficient activity		
Evaluation criterion: 9. Activity and self-reliance of the	9a: 1 = excellent activity, 2 = very good activity, <b>3 = average activity</b> , 4 = weaker, but still sufficient activity, 5 = insufficient activity 9b:		
Evaluation criterion: 9. Activity and self-reliance of the	9a: 1 = excellent activity, 2 = very good activity, <b>3 = average activity,</b> 4 = weaker, but still sufficient activity, 5 = insufficient activity 9b: 1 = excellent self-reliance,		
Evaluation criterion: 9. Activity and self-reliance of the	9a: 1 = excellent activity, 2 = very good activity, <b>3 = average activity</b> , 4 = weaker, but still sufficient activity, 5 = insufficient activity 9b: 1 = excellent self-reliance, <b>2 = very good self-reliance</b> ,		
Evaluation criterion: 9. Activity and self-reliance of the	9a: 1 = excellent activity, 2 = very good activity, <b>3 = average activity</b> , 4 = weaker, but still sufficient activity, 5 = insufficient activity 9b: 1 = excellent self-reliance,		
Evaluation criterion: 9. Activity and self-reliance of the	9a: 1 = excellent activity, 2 = very good activity, <b>3 = average activity</b> , 4 = weaker, but still sufficient activity, 5 = insufficient activity 9b: 1 = excellent self-reliance, <b>2 = very good self-reliance</b> , 3 = average self-reliance,		
Evaluation criterion: 9. Activity and self-reliance of the	9a: 1 = excellent activity, 2 = very good activity, <b>3 = average activity</b> , 4 = weaker, but still sufficient activity, 5 = insufficient activity 9b: 1 = excellent self-reliance, <b>2 = very good self-reliance</b> , 3 = average self-reliance, 4 = weaker, but still sufficient self-reliance, 5 = insufficient self-reliance.		
Evaluation criterion:         9. Activity and self-reliance of the student         Student         Criteria description:         Review student's activity while working on this final thesis, student's punctuality when meeting the de these consultations. Furthermore, review student's independency.         Comments:	<ul> <li>9a:</li> <li>1 = excellent activity,</li> <li>2 = very good activity,</li> <li>3 = average activity,</li> <li>4 = weaker, but still sufficient activity,</li> <li>5 = insufficient activity</li> <li>9b:</li> <li>1 = excellent self-reliance,</li> <li>2 = very good self-reliance,</li> <li>3 = average self-reliance,</li> <li>4 = weaker, but still sufficient self-reliance,</li> <li>5 = insufficient self-reliance.</li> </ul>		
Evaluation criterion:         9. Activity and self-reliance of the student         Student         Criteria description:         Review student's activity while working on this final thesis, student's punctuality when meeting the det these consultations. Furthermore, review student's independency.         Comments:         Activity was sporadic and occasionally unfocused, but dedicated. Independency	<ul> <li>9a:</li> <li>1 = excellent activity,</li> <li>2 = very good activity,</li> <li>3 = average activity,</li> <li>4 = weaker, but still sufficient activity,</li> <li>5 = insufficient activity</li> <li>9b:</li> <li>1 = excellent self-reliance,</li> <li>2 = very good self-reliance,</li> <li>3 = average self-reliance,</li> <li>4 = weaker, but still sufficient self-reliance,</li> <li>5 = insufficient self-reliance.</li> </ul> eadlines and consulting continuously and also, student's preparedness for ndence was admirable in researching and mastering		
Evaluation criterion:         9. Activity and self-reliance of the student         Student         Criteria description:         Review student's activity while working on this final thesis, student's punctuality when meeting the de these consultations. Furthermore, review student's independency.         Comments:	<ul> <li>9a:</li> <li>1 = excellent activity,</li> <li>2 = very good activity,</li> <li>3 = average activity,</li> <li>4 = weaker, but still sufficient activity,</li> <li>5 = insufficient activity</li> <li>9b:</li> <li>1 = excellent self-reliance,</li> <li>2 = very good self-reliance,</li> <li>3 = average self-reliance,</li> <li>4 = weaker, but still sufficient self-reliance,</li> <li>5 = insufficient self-reliance.</li> </ul> eadlines and consulting continuously and also, student's preparedness for ndence was admirable in researching and mastering		
Evaluation criterion:         9. Activity and self-reliance of the student         Student         Criteria description:         Review student's activity while working on this final thesis, student's punctuality when meeting the det these consultations. Furthermore, review student's independency.         Comments:         Activity was sporadic and occasionally unfocused, but dedicated. Independency	<ul> <li>9a:</li> <li>1 = excellent activity,</li> <li>2 = very good activity,</li> <li>3 = average activity,</li> <li>4 = weaker, but still sufficient activity,</li> <li>5 = insufficient activity</li> <li>9b:</li> <li>1 = excellent self-reliance,</li> <li>2 = very good self-reliance,</li> <li>3 = average self-reliance,</li> <li>4 = weaker, but still sufficient self-reliance,</li> <li>5 = insufficient self-reliance.</li> </ul> eadlines and consulting continuously and also, student's preparedness for ndence was admirable in researching and mastering		
Evaluation criterion:         9. Activity and self-reliance of the student         Student         Criteria description:         Review student's activity while working on this final thesis, student's punctuality when meeting the dettee consultations. Furthermore, review student's independency.         Comments:         Activity was sporadic and occasionally unfocused, but dedicated. Independency new topics and software tools, and somewhat less so in meeting intermediate	<ul> <li>9a:</li> <li>1 = excellent activity,</li> <li>2 = very good activity,</li> <li>3 = average activity,</li> <li>4 = weaker, but still sufficient activity,</li> <li>5 = insufficient activity</li> <li>9b:</li> <li>1 = excellent self-reliance,</li> <li>2 = very good self-reliance,</li> <li>3 = average self-reliance,</li> <li>4 = weaker, but still sufficient self-reliance,</li> <li>5 = insufficient self-reliance.</li> </ul>		
Evaluation criterion:         9. Activity and self-reliance of the student         Student         Criteria description:         Review student's activity while working on this final thesis, student's punctuality when meeting the detthese consultations. Furthermore, review student's independency.         Comments:         Activity was sporadic and occasionally unfocused, but dedicated. Independency to pics and software tools, and somewhat less so in meeting intermedence.         Evaluation criterion:	<ul> <li>9a:</li> <li>1 = excellent activity,</li> <li>2 = very good activity,</li> <li>3 = average activity,</li> <li>4 = weaker, but still sufficient activity,</li> <li>5 = insufficient activity</li> <li>9b:</li> <li>1 = excellent self-reliance,</li> <li>2 = very good self-reliance,</li> <li>3 = average self-reliance,</li> <li>4 = weaker, but still sufficient self-reliance,</li> <li>5 = insufficient self-reliance.</li> </ul> eadlines and consulting continuously and also, student's preparedness for Indence was admirable in researching and mastering ediate deadlines and writing up intermediate results. The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). 80 (B)		
Evaluation criterion:         9. Activity and self-reliance of the student         Student         Criteria description:         Review student's activity while working on this final thesis, student's punctuality when meeting the detthese consultations. Furthermore, review student's independency.         Comments:         Activity was sporadic and occasionally unfocused, but dedicated. Independency to pics and software tools, and somewhat less so in meeting intermed the student or the second student of the secon	<ul> <li>9a:</li> <li>1 = excellent activity,</li> <li>2 = very good activity,</li> <li>3 = average activity,</li> <li>4 = weaker, but still sufficient activity,</li> <li>5 = insufficient activity</li> <li>9b:</li> <li>1 = excellent self-reliance,</li> <li>2 = very good self-reliance,</li> <li>3 = average self-reliance,</li> <li>4 = weaker, but still sufficient self-reliance,</li> <li>5 = insufficient self-reliance.</li> </ul> eadlines and consulting continuously and also, student's preparedness for Indence was admirable in researching and mastering ediate deadlines and writing up intermediate results. The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). 80 (B)		
Evaluation criterion:         9. Activity and self-reliance of the student	<ul> <li>9a:</li> <li>1 = excellent activity,</li> <li>2 = very good activity,</li> <li>3 = average activity,</li> <li>4 = weaker, but still sufficient activity,</li> <li>5 = insufficient activity</li> <li>9b:</li> <li>1 = excellent self-reliance,</li> <li>2 = very good self-reliance,</li> <li>3 = average self-reliance,</li> <li>4 = weaker, but still sufficient self-reliance,</li> <li>5 = insufficient self-reliance.</li> </ul> eadlines and consulting continuously and also, student's preparedness for Indence was admirable in researching and mastering ediate deadlines and writing up intermediate results. The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). 80 (B) es not have to be the arithmetic mean or any other formula with the values		
Evaluation criterion:         9. Activity and self-reliance of the student         Student         Criteria description:         Review student's activity while working on this final thesis, student's punctuality when meeting the detthese consultations. Furthermore, review student's independency.         Comments:         Activity was sporadic and occasionally unfocused, but dedicated. Independency to pics and software tools, and somewhat less so in meeting intermediation criterion: <b>10. The overall evaluation</b> Criteria description:         Summarize the parts of the thesis that had major impact on your evaluation. The overall evaluation doe from the previous evaluation criteria 1 to 9.         Comments:         A good attack on a challenging assignment. This work can and should be	<ul> <li>9a:</li> <li>1 = excellent activity,</li> <li>2 = very good activity,</li> <li>3 = average activity,</li> <li>4 = weaker, but still sufficient activity,</li> <li>5 = insufficient activity</li> <li>9b:</li> <li>1 = excellent self-reliance,</li> <li>2 = very good self-reliance,</li> <li>3 = average self-reliance,</li> <li>4 = weaker, but still sufficient self-reliance,</li> <li>5 = insufficient self-reliance.</li> </ul> eadlines and consulting continuously and also, student's preparedness for Indence was admirable in researching and mastering ediate deadlines and writing up intermediate results. The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F). 80 (B) extended to better showcase the large amount of		
<ul> <li>Evaluation criterion:</li> <li>9. Activity and self-reliance of the student</li> <li>Student</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>9a:</li> <li>1 = excellent activity,</li> <li>2 = very good activity,</li> <li>3 = average activity,</li> <li>4 = weaker, but still sufficient activity,</li> <li>5 = insufficient activity</li> <li>9b:</li> <li>1 = excellent self-reliance,</li> <li>2 = very good self-reliance,</li> <li>3 = average self-reliance,</li> <li>4 = weaker, but still sufficient self-reliance,</li> <li>5 = insufficient self-reliance.</li> <li>eadlines and consulting continuously and also, student's preparedness for</li> <li>and ence was admirable in researching and mastering</li> <li>ediate deadlines and writing up intermediate results.</li> <li>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</li> <li>80 (B)</li> <li>as not have to be the arithmetic mean or any other formula with the values</li> <li>extended to better showcase the large amount of hesis does an excellent job of presenting the</li> </ul>		
Evaluation criterion:         9. Activity and self-reliance of the student         Student         Criteria description:         Review student's activity while working on this final thesis, student's punctuality when meeting the detthese consultations. Furthermore, review student's independency.         Comments:         Activity was sporadic and occasionally unfocused, but dedicated. Independency to pics and software tools, and somewhat less so in meeting intermediation criterion: <b>10. The overall evaluation</b> Criteria description:         Summarize the parts of the thesis that had major impact on your evaluation. The overall evaluation doe from the previous evaluation criteria 1 to 9.         Comments:         A good attack on a challenging assignment. This work can and should be	<ul> <li>9a:</li> <li>1 = excellent activity,</li> <li>2 = very good activity,</li> <li>3 = average activity,</li> <li>4 = weaker, but still sufficient activity,</li> <li>5 = insufficient activity</li> <li>9b:</li> <li>1 = excellent self-reliance,</li> <li>2 = very good self-reliance,</li> <li>3 = average self-reliance,</li> <li>4 = weaker, but still sufficient self-reliance,</li> <li>5 = insufficient self-reliance.</li> <li>eadlines and consulting continuously and also, student's preparedness for</li> <li>and ence was admirable in researching and mastering</li> <li>and edite deadlines and writing up intermediate results.</li> <li>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</li> <li>80 (B)</li> <li>as not have to be the arithmetic mean or any other formula with the values</li> <li>extended to better showcase the large amount of hesis does an excellent job of presenting the arithmetic mean or any other showcasing the</li> </ul>		

Signature of the supervisor: