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### Assignment

**B (veľmi dobre).**

*Evaluation of thesis difficulty of assignment.*

The work was difficult as can be seen in the depth of the processing of some chapters, but well done.

### Satisfaction of assignment
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### Method of conception

**B (veľmi dobre)**

*Assess that student has chosen correct approach or solution methods.*

The student has chosen the right approach and sequence, the only objection is that other diagnostic methods to determine the extent of structural damage (semi-destructive and non-destructive) have not been used or mentioned. The methods used, apart from the moisture measurements, are considered semi-destructive - destructive.
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### Selection of sources, citation correctness

**A (výborne)**
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