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3. Meeting the targets specified work

- excellent ☑
- above aver. ☑
- average ☑
- below aver. ☑
- weak ☑

Comments:

The subject of the thesis was the application of structural damage identification technique based on dynamic properties of the system, calibration of numerical models against experimental data and parametric study on most probable damage distribution due to blast. The target was completed.

4. Expertise approach to work

- excellent ☑
- above aver. ☑
- average ☑
- below aver. ☑
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Comments:

The abilities and expertise of the student were appropriate to develop the present work.
5. The autonomy of the student
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