CTU
CZECH TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY IN PRAGUE

THESIS REVIEWER'S REPORT

I. IDENTIFICATION DATA

Thesis title:	**DESIGN OF AIR-CONDITIONING SYSTEM FOR AN OFFICE BUILDING**
Author's name:	**YANG JUNHAO, (personal ID Nr. 473273)**
Type of thesis :	master
Faculty/Institute:	Faculty of Mechanical Engineering (FME)
Department:	DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING
Thesis reviewer:	Ing. Lukáš Putta, Ph.D.
Reviewer's department:	

II. EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA

Assignment — **ordinarily challenging**

How demanding was the assigned project?

Fulfilment of assignment — **fulfilled with minor objections**

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.

Generally, it fulfils assigned task. For calculations were used simplified formulas. Design of ducts does not correspond with unit fan parameters.

Methodology — **partially applicable**

Comment on the correctness of the approach and/or the solution methods.

Orientation of building is not simple N, W, E, S – Building does not have rectangular floor plan. Calculation of radiations gains would be affected.

Technical level — **E - sufficient.**

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

For calculations were used simplified formulas. For calculation of windows convection gains should have ben used dimensions including frame, not only glass area.

Formal and language level, scope of thesis — **E - sufficient.**

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?

Some of words are synonym words used in other professions. Eg. Muffler / should have been silencer and others

Selection of sources, citation correctness — **F - failed.**

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?

Some web links does not work, some links are on web pages in Chines language (character sand).

Additional commentary and evaluation (optional)

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.

Explain difference between sensible and latent heat, show it in h-x diagram?

Which dimension of window you would use for calculation of heat transmittance and which dimension of window would you use for calculation of radiation heat gains?

CTU
CZECH TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY IN PRAGUE

THESIS REVIEWER'S REPORT

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

The thesis is from my point of view on the verge of acceptability. Anyway, I have decided it to recommend it for thesis defense.

The grade that I award for the thesis is **E - sufficient.**

Date: **21.1.2021**

Signature: