Review report of a final thesis

Student:	Mykyta Boiko
Reviewer:	Ing. Jiří Novák, Ph.D.
Thesis title:	Online Clearing center
Branch of the study:	Web and Software Engineering

Date: 29. 5. 2019

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.
1. Fulfilment of the assignment	1 = assignment fulfilled, 2 = assignment fulfilled with minor objections, **3 = assignment fulfilled with major objections,** 4 = assignment not fulfilled

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 goals of the thesis were fulfilled except the point "5. Document and test the solution" (see the comments to the written part of the thesis below).

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
2. Main written part	*51 (E)*

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:
There is a big disproportion between the first and the second half of the thesis. The chapters Introduction, Analysis, and Design are quite good. On the other hand, the parts Realization and Testing are merged into one chapter having only 3 pages. The description of implementation is very general. I would like to see more details than e.g. a simple code of a button function. The testing is covered by one paragraph. The Bibliography contains only 4 references. There are only two acronyms on the list in Appendix A but more than ten others occur in the text. However, the thesis contains more than 30 pages of the main text and it meets the minimal requirements for a bachelor thesis.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
3. Non-written part, attachments	*85 (B)*

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:
I was not able to launch the software from the attached medium. However, from the practical demonstration of the tool I know that the application has nice interface and works well.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
4. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards	*85 (B)*

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 application could be used for buying/selling cryptocurrency signals in practice. However, the random signals have to be replaced by real signals generated by developers of trading strategies. The prototype application is also not connected to the real cryptocurrency markets yet.

Evaluation criterion:	*No evaluation scale.*

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:

1) Why the text part of the thesis is so poor ?
2) Do you have an installation guide at least in the electronic form ?

Evaluation criterion:	*The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).*

6. The overall evaluation

51 (E)

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:

Poor quality of the text part of the thesis. However, I recommend the thesis to be defended without changes.

Signature of the reviewer: