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## II. EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA

### Assignment

**Challenging**

*How demanding was the assigned project?*

The challenging part was to keep track of rapid development of the company training and guilds management in Quanti s.r.o.

### Fulfillment of assignment

**Fulfilled**

*How well does the thesis fulfill the assigned task? Have the primary goals been achieved? Which assigned tasks have been incompletely covered, and which parts of the thesis are overextended? Justify your answer.*

The project made the whole way from the design to tested running application on the test server; only the situation around Covid-19 prevented it from being deployed to the production.

### Methodology

**Outstanding**

*Comment on the correctness of the approach and/or the solution methods.*

The student’s approach to the project proves his own experience with real production development of software products. The involvement of requirements survey and its reevaluation during the development has paramount importance for the real-life project.

### Technical level

**A - Excellent**

*Is the thesis technically sound? How well did the student employ expertise in the field of his/her field of study? Does the student explain clearly what he/she has done?*

Design of the whole project uses modern approach to modular web-based application. All mentioned versions of programming languages and frameworks are fairly modern and up to date.

### Formal and language level, scope of thesis

**B - Very Good**


Czech version of the abstract should have been translated better. English is good and overall the work is legible and well structured. Almost 60 pages of the thesis are well beyond the required scope.

### Selection of sources, citation correctness

**C - Good**

*Does the thesis make adequate reference to earlier work on the topic? Was the selection of sources adequate? Is the student’s original work clearly distinguished from earlier work in the field? Do the bibliographic citations meet the standards?*

The first two sources are mentioned in the Bachelor’s thesis assignment only but not in the text of the thesis.

### Additional commentary and evaluation (optional)

*Comment on the overall quality of the thesis, its novelty and its impact on the field, its strengths and weaknesses, the utility of the solution that is presented, the theoretical/formal level, the student’s skillfulness, etc.*
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III. OVERALL EVALUATION, QUESTIONS FOR THE PRESENTATION AND DEFENSE OF THE THESIS, SUGGESTED GRADE

Summarize your opinion on the thesis and explain your final grading. Pose questions that should be answered during the presentation and defense of the student’s work.

The technical side of this thesis is excellent for the bachelor’s degree with good architecture design. The student proves his knowledge from different areas of SW development.

The only downside of the thesis is Czech abstract and lack of sources. English and the facts are correct.

Questions:
Could you describe in more detail the reasons for abandoning unit tests?
Did you do any other performance tests other than the measurement of the response time of some endpoints mentioned in section 7.2?
How did you cover the build and deployment process?

The grade that I award for the thesis is **B - very good.**
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