

I. IDENTIFICATION DATA

Thesis title:	Semantic Document Manager User Interface
Author's name:	Chyzhova Valeryia
Type of thesis :	bachelor
Faculty/Institute:	Faculty of Electrical Engineering (FEE)
Department:	Department of Computer Science
Thesis reviewer:	Ing. Ivo Malý, Ph.D.
Reviewer's department:	Department of Computer Graphics and Interaction

II. EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA

Assignment	challenging
<i>How demanding was the assigned project?</i>	
The assignment is challenging. It combines user interface design and also implementation of the final application. Part of the assignment is also an analysis of the existing semantic document management system used as a back-end counterpart of the created application.	

Fulfilment of assignment	fulfilled with minor objections
<i>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.</i>	
The student fulfilled the assignment with few remarks: 1) It is unclear whether she took other existing projects developed at KBSS into account during the analysis phase. 2) The user evaluation report is missing essential details about participants. 3) Evaluation tasks should be more realistic when there is an intention to evaluate user experience (UX) and not just user interface (UI).	

Methodology	correct
<i>Comment on the correctness of the approach and/or the solution methods.</i>	
The chosen solution procedure is correct. The student analyzed the back-end part of the system, including API endpoints and data entities. Then she designed the front-end application, both from the user interface (UI) and usability points of view in chapter 3 and from the technical point of view in chapters 4 and 5. It is not clear whether the student used some prototyping tool for UI designed or directly implemented it. The UI design was created with some best practices from the literature. However, there was no evaluation of the design before the implementation phase, e.g., using at least methods without users like Heuristic evaluation or Cognitive walkthrough. Implementation and usability testing of the application is appropriate for such an application, but the student should make more effort to report errors when the back-end is not reachable.	

Technical level	B - very good.
<i>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?</i>	
The student used her knowledge from practical and theoretical courses and literature. All steps are described in sufficient detail. Test scenarios in usability tests should be more realistic. It is not likely that the user will create a folder with the name "New folder" during real work. It is also not clear how many participants were involved in the usability evaluation. Since KBSS will probably further develop the front-end, the source code should have been appropriately commented on and documented.	

Formal and language level, scope of thesis	A - excellent.
<i>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?</i>	

The text of the thesis has suitable structure and content. The text is written in English, and there are no major grammar mistakes. The page range is above average. Code examples are short and concise.

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?

There are 37 references in the theses, all relevant to the topic of the thesis. The student was using mainly electronic sources, but some books and articles were also included. References are used correctly in the text.

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.

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. Pose questions that should be answered during the presentation and defense of the student's work.

The student presented very good work and demonstrated the ability to solve assigned tasks. The final application meets the initial requirements. Minor issues are in the design and usability evaluation phase, where additional evaluation and more practical tasks should be employed.

The grade that I award for the thesis is **B - very good**.

Date: **5.6.2021**

Signature: