

Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

Supervisor: doc. Dr. André Sopczak

Student: Peter Žáčik

Thesis title: Implementation of a Portal Dedicated to Higgs Bosons for

Experts and the General Public

Branch / specialization: Web and Software Engineering, specialization Software

Engineering

Created on: 7 June 2021

Evaluation criteria

1. Fulfillment of the assignment

- ▶ [1] assignment fulfilled
 - [2] assignment fulfilled with minor objections
 - [3] assignment fulfilled with major objections
 - [4] assignment not fulfilled

All aspects of the assignment are fulfilled.

2. Main written part

95/100 (A)

The thesis is well written, and was already in very good shape before proof-reading. All parts of the thesis are concise and well written. There are no detected errors or inconcistancies. The logical structure is correct and the chapters follow naturally. Citations are used properly when needed.

3. Non-written part, attachments

90/100 (A)

The software is well developed and modular. Maintaining the software and possible future extensions is straight forward. The technology is very adequate and challenges of the article classifications according to the title and abstract information are well mastered. The performance of correct classifications is good, and there are naturally possibilities to improve the classification algorithm to improve the classification performance further. The other challenge was the use of the available CERN tools for the deployment of the webpage. Also this aspect has been addressed very well.

95/100 (A)

The thesis results are already deployed and in use. The software works as expected and after making the Higgs Boson Portal more known in the community, it could be useful for an increasing number of users. As there was no comparative web portal before this project can be seen as as a novelty with growing attention.

5. Activity of the student

- ▶ [1] excellent activity
 - [2] very good activity
 - [3] average activity
 - [4] weaker, but still sufficient activity
 - [5] insufficient activity

Peter Žáčik worked very independently on the thesis and adjusted very well to the given conditions. In particular to using the CERN tools for deployment which he had to learn. He was always well prepared for the consultations. Very positive was also his continuous progress towards finishing the project well in time.

6. Self-reliance of the student

- ▶ [1] excellent self-reliance
 - [2] very good self-reliance
 - [3] average self-reliance
 - [4] weaker, but still sufficient self-reliance
 - [5] insufficient self-reliance

His research work can be characterised as systematic and productive. Peter Žáčik brought many initiatives to the consultations and was able to adjust to the needs.

The overall evaluation

95 /100 (A)

The success of completing and deploying the project is noted very positively. Strong points are the smooth progress, using the rights tools, and overcoming the challenging systematically.

Instructions

Fulfillment of the assignment

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.

Main written part

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.

Non-written part, attachments

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.

Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards

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.

Activity of the student

From your experience with the course of the work on the thesis and its outcome, review the student's activity while working on the thesis, his/her punctuality when meeting the deadlines and whether he/she consulted you as he/she went along and also, whether he/she was well prepared for these consultations.

Self-reliance of the student

From your experience with the course of the work on the thesis and its outcome, assess the student's ability to develop independent creative work.

The overall evaluation

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.