Review report of a final thesis

Student:	Bc. Petr Bárta
Reviewer:	Ing. Michal Valenta, Ph.D.
Thesis title:	Web Application for Discoveries with the ATLAS Forward Proton Detector at CERN
Branch of the study:	Web and Software Engineering

Date: 9. 6. 2020

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:
Actual posted work in fact provides only introduction to the application from physics point of view. It lacks the point of view of software engineering, especially functional and non-functional requirements, design, discussion of an implementation platform, implementation, testing, and documentation.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
2. Main written part	30 (F)

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:
See the first section of the review.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
3. Non-written part, attachments	10 (F)

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:
See the first section of the review.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
4. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards	20 (F)

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:
See the first section of the review.

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:

There are no questions to the actual state of the work.

Evaluation criterion:	*The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).*
6. The overall evaluation	*20 (F)*

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 author is probably already well acquainted with the application domain - the physical nature of the future application. It is necessary to apply standard methods of software engineering and finish the assignment.

I recommend to evaluate the work in the actual state by grade F, but I also recommend to continue with the same assignment with the same supervisor and post the re-done (extended) work for the next defense term.

Signature of the reviewer: