



Review report of a final thesis

Reviewer: doc. Ing. Mgr. Petr Klán, CSc.
Student: Bogdan Putintsev
Thesis title: Tools for users embedding to video
Branch / specialization: Web and Software Engineering, specialization Computer Graphics
Created on: 26 May 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

The analytical part is done very well. In the implementation part, at least according to the text, there are elementary parameters of the user, including JSON. However, a substantial part of point 4 - user download with predefined parameters - is missing. Point 6 of the assignment - testing is also missing. I think that the author successfully implemented some initial steps, but ended somewhere in the middle.

2. Main written part 70/100 (C)

The thesis is professionally well constructed. It analyzes the problem in detail, including an explanation of the MVC principle. It also presents some exemplary examples focused on augmented reality. I regret that the author did not choose one of these examples and did not show it in the implementation part in combination with his results.

3. Non-written part, attachments 80/100 (B)

The problem of tools that the author solved is needed, for example, for the increasingly used mobile augmented reality. It is clear from the work that the author identified the elementary parameters. How he used and tested them is not clear.

4. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards 70/100 (C)

The results of the work can be considered partial. Therefore, they cannot be used directly and need to be further processed.

The overall evaluation

70 /100 (C)

The author focuses on the analysis and synthesis of a problem called video-embedding. The analytical part is performed in a satisfactory manner. The practical part stopped at identifying very basic parameters of the user before downloading him into a video. The essential part concerning the insertion of the predefined user into the video and testing the implementation is not described. Therefore, I have no choice but to assume that it has not been implemented. Assignment was therefore only partially fulfilled.

Questions for the defense

Can I ask the author to upload himself with preset parameters to a video that he presents in the analytical part of the thesis and play this video, for example, on his mobile phone as an augmented reality?

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.

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.