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## Evaluation criterion:

### 1. Fulfilment of the assignment

**Criteria description:**
Assess whether the submitted FT defines the objectives sufficiently and in line with the assignment; whether the objectives are formulated correctly and fulfilled sufficiently. In the comment, specify the points of the assignment that have not been met, assess the severity, impact, and, if appropriate, also the cause of the deficiencies. If the assignment differs substantially from the standards for the FT or if the student has developed the FT beyond the assignment, describe the way it got reflected on the quality of the assignment's fulfilment and the way it affected your final evaluation.

**Comments:**
The ultimate goal of the thesis is to implement a framework for displaying data linked to the RÚIAN registry. Furthermore, the student had to get familiar with the RDF/Semantic Web related concepts and technologies. The student completely fulfilled the assignment.

### 2. Main written part

**Criteria description:**
Evaluate whether the extent of the FT is adequate to its content and scope: are all the parts of the FT contentful and necessary? Next, consider whether the submitted FT is actually correct – are there factual errors or inaccuracies? Evaluate the logical structure of the FT, the thematic flow between chapters and whether the text is comprehensible to the reader. Assess whether the formal notations in the FT are used correctly. Assess the typographic and language aspects of the FT, follow the Dean's Directive No. 26/2017, Art. 3. Evaluate whether the relevant sources are properly used, quoted and cited. Verify that all quotes are properly distinguished from the results achieved in the FT, thus, that the citation ethics has not been violated and that the citations are complete and in accordance with citation practices and standards. Finally, evaluate whether the software and other copyrighted works have been used in accordance with their license terms.

**Comments:**
The thesis provides all necessary parts, which are complete, well balanced, and properly organized. The student properly cites the relevant work.

### 3. Non-written part, attachments

**Criteria description:**
Depending on the nature of the FT, comment on the non-written part of the thesis. For example: SW work – the overall quality of the program. Is the technology used (from the development to deployment) suitable and adequate? HW – functional sample. Evaluate the technology and tools used. Research and experimental work – repeatability of the experiment.

**Comments:**
The student designed, developed and tested a framework for visualization of RDF/geospatial data. The developed framework is of high quality and implemented with relevant technologies.

### 4. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards

**Criteria description:**
Depending on the nature of the thesis, estimate whether the thesis results could be deployed in practice; alternatively, evaluate whether the results of the FT extend the already published/known results or whether they bring in completely new findings.

**Comments:**
The developed framework and the mobile application are well developed with high potential for their publication on a relevant scientific conference.
5. Questions for the defence

Criteria description:
Formulate questions that the student should answer during the Presentation and defence of the FT in front of the SFE Committee (use a bullet list).

Questions:
- Explain how the scalability of the framework can be improved w.r.t. different technologies considered in the implementation (e.g. Solr, mongoDB, Fuseki)?

Evaluation criterion:

6. The overall evaluation

Criteria description:
Summarize which of the aspects of the FT affected your grading process the most. The overall grade does not need to be an arithmetic mean (or other value) calculated from the evaluation in the previous criteria. Generally, a well-fulfilled assignment is assessed by grade A.

Comments:
The written part, as well as the implementation part of the thesis, are of high quality. The student managed to apply the knowledge acquired during the studies and develop a software prototype of high quality.
I recommend grade A.
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