**FACULTY
OF INFORMATION
TECHNOLOGY
CTU IN PRAGUE**

Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

Student:	Alexey Karpovskiy
Supervisor:	Ing. Zdeněk Rybola, Ph.D.
Thesis title:	CookBook - menu planning application
Branch of the study:	Software Engineering

Date: 8. 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:
The assignment might be considered fulfilled with the following objections:
- The analysis of existing solutions is very short and limited, without any details or clear overview of functions and limitations.
- No updated project documentation was provided besides the model containing only the diagrams from the thesis and the thesis itself.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
2. Main written part	*60 (D)*

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:
The written part of the thesis is weak. The English language is not very good, the thesis contains many grammar mistakes. There are also many factual problems and mistakes such as:
- Mr. Khazaradze is mentioned twice in the list of students participating in the original project.
- Many mistakes in various UML diagram throughout the whole thesis (state model of Request, activity model of Request, class models, sequence models).
- The analysis of existing solutions is very brief and limited.
- The description of selected technologies is too generic and without any alternatives and reasons to choose these specific ones. The provided reasons match to many other similar technologies completely ignored.
- In the architectural model, the correct code structure is not reflected - views, beans, controllers, data packages.
- Description of database model does not reflect the code nor the diagram - user's permissions, no FK and references in the database.
- Methods and classes' interactions in the sequence models do not reflect the code at all, the implementation is completely different.
- The class diagrams describe different parts of the application, not related to each other. In general, the description of the architecture and design of the solution is extremely brief without many details and it is almost impossible to understand its principles.
- Regarding the bibliography, only references to homepages of the used technologies are cited. No sources about application design principles, analytical processes, or anything related to development process.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
3. Non-written part, attachments	*75 (C)*

Comments:

The result of the thesis is a prototype of Java web application for managing recipes and menus in a restaurant. However, the application processes and user interaction with the application are not very intuitive and clear to achieve the required result or find the necessary information.

Besides the prototype of the application, also an installation guide and user guide is provided (although not references from the thesis at all). Also, code documentation (javadoc) and model (containing only pure diagrams from the thesis) is provided. The code is provided on the attached CD and in the repository of the project on FIT gitlab. The structure of the code separates presentation, business and data logic to different packages. Interfaces are used to separate the layers and decrease coupling. Some sections of the code are too long and would deserve further decomposition.

Evaluation criterion:	*The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).*
4. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards	*70 (C)*

Comments:

The result of the project is a much-improved version of the CookBook application in comparison with the original version created in the software team project. However, the quality of the application is still rather a prototype which would need more focus on user-friendliness and flow of the processes.

As no detailed documentation of the project is provided, it might be difficult for anyone else to carry on with the improvements. On the other hand, the code is versioned on gitlab of FIT under the ownership of the supervisor, so it can be easily shared with new developers.

Evaluation criterion:	*The evaluation scale: 1 to 5.*
5. Activity and self-reliance of the student	*5a:* *1 = excellent activity,* *2 = very good activity,* **3 = average activity,** *4 = weaker, but still sufficient activity,* *5 = insufficient activity* *5b:* *1 = excellent self-reliance,* *2 = very good self-reliance,* **3 = average self-reliance,** *4 = weaker, but still sufficient self-reliance,* *5 = insufficient self-reliance.*

Comments:

The activity of the student was average. The student attended a consultation several times and did his best to apply the feedback to the project. However, if the activity was bigger, the result might have been much better.

Evaluation criterion:	*The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).*
6. The overall evaluation	*60 (D)*

Comments:

I consider the thesis a weaker one, especially from the point of view of the written part which misses a lot of important information to fully understand the required functions, implemented improvements, architectural and design principles and final realization. On the other hand, the result is much better than the original version created in the previous Software Team Project, although it can be still considered a prototype at the best.

Signature of the supervisor: