



Review report of a final thesis

Student: Bich Phuong Phamová
Reviewer: Ing. Marek Suchánek
Thesis title: Android mobile application for personal safety
Branch of the study: Web and Software Engineering

Date: 18. 5. 2020

<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.</i>
1. Fulfilment of the assignment	1 = assignment fulfilled, 2 = assignment fulfilled with minor objections, 3 = assignment fulfilled with major objections, 4 = assignment not fulfilled
<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> All objectives of the thesis are successfully fulfilled: five existing applications are analyzed and described, and then own personal safety application is designed and implemented according to set requirements. Both UI and software architecture are well designed. Suitable technologies, including Firebase, are used for the implementation as well as testing. Aside from required user testing, also unit and instrumented tests were carried out. Finally, possible steps for future development are set in the thesis.	
<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i>
2. Main written part	85 (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 is written in English on a fully adequate level of the university graduate. All parts are relevant and accurate. Outline follows software development cycle naturally according to software engineering practice. The only note to this is that on page 10 is already described what functionalities the prototype has even before the chapter with requirements specification. There are also some minor issues such as inconsistencies, e.g., "requirements specifications" and "requirements specification". Citations are used in accordance with customs and standards set for the thesis - the only exception is ambiguity when a citation is used in the middle of a paragraph but after a dot (e.g., in section 4.1 – FAB, but also other places in the text).	
<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i>
3. Non-written part, attachments	100 (A)
<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> All objectives of the thesis are successfully fulfilled: five existing applications are analyzed and described, and then own personal safety application is designed and implemented according to set requirements. Both UI and software architecture are well designed. Suitable technologies, including Firebase, are used for the implementation as well as testing. Aside from required user testing, also unit and instrumented tests were carried out. Finally, possible steps for future development are set in the thesis.	
<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i>

4. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards

95 (A)

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 developed application prototype can be used in practice and further improved according to described possibilities. Moreover, the thesis itself contains valuable review and description of existing applications and used technologies for Android apps development.

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:

- The app is Android-only. Why? Have you considered some technologies that would allow a cross-platform app?
- Are you going to distribute the application, if so – how? (Both in terms of source code and end-users.)
- How do you plan to continue with the development of this application?

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:

As described previously, all objectives were accomplished. The thesis, together with all attachments, is submitted with overall very high quality. It presents well the knowledge and skills of the student in the field of software engineering.

Signature of the reviewer: