



## Review report of a final thesis

**Student:** Atsamaz Akopyan  
**Reviewer:** Ing. Michal Štepanovský, Ph.D.  
**Thesis title:** Testing environment for probe server  
**Branch of the study:** Software Engineering

**Date:** 30. 7. 2019

<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.</i>
<b>1. Fulfilment of the assignment</b>	<b>1 = assignment fulfilled, 2 = assignment fulfilled with minor objections, 3 = assignment fulfilled with major objections, 4 = assignment not fulfilled</b>
<i>Criteria description:</i> 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.	
<i>Comments:</i> This thesis meets all the guidelines given in the ASSIGNMENT OF BACHELOR'S THESIS.	
<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i>
<b>2. Main written part</b>	<b>91 (A)</b>
<i>Criteria description:</i> 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.	
<i>Comments:</i> The thesis has a clear organization, it is easy to follow, and it is easy to find the information that the reader is looking for. I didn't find any inconsistency or evident flaws. Student clearly reports his work, including the issues he needed to solve. I appreciate the fact that the student didn't underestimate the testing, especially user testing, which is one of the crucial parts of every software development life cycle. The programmers guide and user guide is provided as well.  Formal look and English level of the thesis are above the average. All relevant references are cited; however, the format of references should follow citation rules more strictly (e.g. missing second names in reference 15).	
<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i>
<b>3. Non-written part, attachments</b>	<b>95 (A)</b>
<i>Criteria description:</i> 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.	
<i>Comments:</i> The quality of implemented SW tool is above the average. Source files are easy to understand with a lot of comments. This part of the student's work is the essential part of the bachelor thesis.	
<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i>
<b>4. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards</b>	<b>100 (A)</b>
<i>Criteria description:</i> 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 results of this thesis find the use in the real praxis. In fact, this thesis is realized for Anritsu, what is a company providing testing and monitoring solutions for the communications industry. In detail, the results of this thesis provide a software for automate probe server testing.

*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:*

Explain what you have learned during the work on this thesis.

*Evaluation criterion:*

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

**6. The overall evaluation**

*95 (A)*

*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:*

My final evaluation of the master thesis is A - excellent.

Signature of the reviewer: