

# MASTER THESIS SUPERVISOR REVIEW

#### I. PERSONAL AND STUDY DETAILS

ar Poonam Pravinkumar
ty of Biomedical Engineering
edical and Clinical Technology
edical Engineering

Personal ID number: 473069

# **II. EVALUATION OF THE MASTER THESIS**

Me	thods of measurement and evaluation of postural stability using a transportable system	
	Evaluation criteria	N. of points
1.	Attitude of the student (preparation, initiative, work morale and independence). (0 – 30)* Comment: 10 points - in case of standard communication of the student with the supervisor, 10 points - how can student apply knowledge from other subjects, 5 points - reliability, 5 points - if the student tries to bring own ideas or tries to solve all assigned issues.	23
2.	Manner and level of elaboration of the thesis and fulfilment of the assignment. (0 – 30)* Comment: supervisor judges how was the student able to prepare the individual parts of the thesis using knowledge and skills from other subjects (10 points), ability to present the topic (10 points), ability to create coherent professional text explaining own contribution - in case of the diploma thesis the topic must not be the same as for the bachelor thesis (10 points)!	24
3.	Scope of experimental work (SW, HW), applied knowledge, publications and other activities, including awards connected with the topic of the thesis. (0 – 30)* Comment: if the student actively participated in writing part of the paper in English (is a co-author) – 4 points, created a model – 4 points, created software – 4 points, technical realisation – 4 points (this can be replaced by a patent or utility model). 4 points for full functionality of both of SW and HW - then 20 points in total can be given. Provable participation in scientific and research project (5 points) and provable good position in competitions (5 points) - then additional 10 points can be given. It means 30 points in total for a very complex and flawless work including other activities such as participation in project, writing papers, creating patents or utility models.	6
1.	Formal requisites and layout of the thesis (writing mastery, structuring, graphs, tables, citations in the text, list of references etc.). $(0 - 10)^*$ Currently, students have materials explaining how to prepare a professional text on PC, they have all knowledge and skills; therefore it is not necessary to make allowances for the quality of PC processing. The list of contents of the thesis should have decimal system. Consider references between the individual parts including equation numbering, pictures, tables and graphs (2 points), whether it contains important features with respect to the type of thesis (2 points). Only standard terminology should be used especially in the English language (ability to express oneself with the use of professional language - 2 points), if graphs are according to the rules (see tolerance and influence of statistical processing - 1 point), if there are relevant captions for graphs and tables and everything is readable (1 point), observance of citation rules ISO690 and ISO690-2 (2 points).	7
5.	Total points	60

# **III. THE OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE LEVEL OF THE MASTER THESIS**

Grade**:	A (excellent)	B (very good)	C (good)	D (satisfactory)	E (sufficient)	F (failed)			
Number of points:	100 - 90	89 - 80	79 - 70	69 - 60	59 - 50	< 50			
				х					
** in case of F (failed) please explain in detail									

I give the above grade to the master thesis and I recommend/do not recommend it for the defence.

# **IV. COMMENTS**

In his work, the student focused on the processing and analysis of data measured on 3 different groups of military professions. The introduction of the work is sufficient with a reminder that some claims should refer to the corresponding resources. The strongest part of the work is a State of the art, which describes currently used systems for measuring of the body posture and the stability and, at its end, it summarizes their properties and suitability of their use. The methodology chapter is well structured and the student proposes a statistical test suitable for comparing the groups studied. However I miss a description of the selected statistical parameters studied and the reasons for their selection. The results chapter should contain brief descriptions of the calculated quantities. The description of the measurement results in the discussion chapter is relatively brief and there is no comparison with other studies.

Considering the above, I recommend the thesis for the defense and propose grade D - satisfactory.

Name and surname incl. degrees: Ing. Jan Hejda, Ph.D. Institution: ČVUT v Praze, Fakulta biomedicínského inženýrství Contact address: Nám. Sítná 3105, 272 01 Kladno Signature: .....