# CTU CZECH TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY IN PRAGUE

### THESIS SUPERVISOR'S REPORT

#### I. IDENTIFICATION DATA

Thesis title: Phishing detection using natural language processing

Author's name: Bc. Radek Starosta

**Type of thesis:** master

**Faculty/Institute:** Faculty of Electrical Engineering (FEE) **Department:** Department of Computer Science

Thesis reviewer: Ing. Jan Brabec

**Reviewer's department:** Department of Computer Science

#### II. EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA

**Assignment** challenging

How demanding was the assigned project?

I find the project to be of higher difficulty. It required good understanding of multiple technologies and combines mlengineering work with data science.

#### **Fulfilment of assignment**

fulfilled

How well does the thesis fulfil the assigned task? Have the primary goals been achieved? Which assigned tasks have been incompletely covered, and which parts of the thesis are overextended? Justify your answer.

All parts of the assignment are fulfilled.

#### Activity and independence when creating final thesis

A - excellent.

Assess whether the student had a positive approach, whether the time limits were met, whether the conception was regularly consulted and whether the student was well prepared for the consultations. Assess the student's ability to work independently.

Radek was able to actively come up with new ideas and take total ownership of large pieces of work. He explored the topics thoroughly and was able to correctly consider various tradeoffs of different approaches.

Technical level A - excellent.

Is the thesis technically sound? How well did the student employ expertise in his/her field of study? Does the student explain clearly what he/she has done?

I find the thesis technically sound. The various sub-problems are explained to a correct level of detail. In Chapters 4-5 the final design is well explained, but I would appreciate a bit more discussion on the alternative approaches (e.g. Waitress as an alternative to Gunicorn) that were considered but not chosen. Multiple alternatives were considered and not all of that is captured in the text. Still, the thesis is already 60 pages long so I understand why not every considered alternative solution was included in the final text.

#### Formal level and language level, scope of thesis

A - excellent.

Are formalisms and notations used properly? Is the thesis organized in a logical way? Is the thesis sufficiently extensive? Is the thesis well-presented? Is the language clear and understandable? Is the English satisfactory?

The thesis is well-formatted and the level of English is excellent.

#### Selection of sources, citation correctness

A - excellent.

Does the thesis make adequate reference to earlier work on the topic? Was the selection of sources adequate? Is the student's original work clearly distinguished from earlier work in the field? Do the bibliographic citations meet the standards?

Thesis cites 119 references. The references are relevant and well-formatted.

#### Additional commentary and evaluation (optional)



## THESIS SUPERVISOR'S REPORT

Comment on the overall quality of the thesis, its novelty and its impact on the field, its strengths and weaknesses, the utility of the solution that is presented, the theoretical/formal level, the student's skillfulness, etc.

Student worked on a broader project as a part of a larger team composed of multiple engineers and researchers. He was one of the key members of the team. He participated actively on all topics that he includes in the thesis and multiple chapters are based on a work he has done fully by himself.

# III. OVERALL EVALUATION, QUESTIONS FOR THE PRESENTATION AND DEFENSE OF THE THESIS, SUGGESTED GRADE

Summarize your opinion on the thesis and explain your final grading.

The thesis is of very high-quality and the student's work was consistently excellent. The grade that I award for the thesis is **A - excellent**.

Date: **20.1.2021** Signature: