CTU
CZECH TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY IN PRAGUE

THESIS REVIEWER'S REPORT

I. IDENTIFICATION DATA

Thesis title:	**Industrial IoT Web Application for Motor Characteristic Monitoring**
Author's name:	**Sami Jradi**
Type of thesis :	master
Faculty/Institute:	Faculty of Mechanical Engineering (FME)
Department:	Department of instrumentation and control engineering
Thesis reviewer:	Sebastian Thiemann
Reviewer's department:	Siemens, s.r.o.

II. EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA

Assignment — **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.

Implementation of the application is fulfilled.
Very good introduction to the used components and overview of technologies.
Missing evaluation of application's performance / benchmarking of technology.
Not enough test cases for application as well as lack of proper interpretation of the test results from real machine. Missing conclusions.

Methodology — **outstanding**

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

Student used the correct methods of conception.

Technical level — **A - excellent.**

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?

The student has used the correct approach to solve all tasks.

Formal and language level, scope of thesis — **B - very good.**

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?

Overall the thesis is structured in a logical way and the arising questions are answered in the right order.
The student has not always used unique naming / wordings (e.g. backend vs back-end). Sometimes the student uses informal language (e.g. we have button ... it enables us...)

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?

The student used more relevant sources that have match level. All Sources are right cited.

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.

CTU
CZECH TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY IN PRAGUE

THESIS REVIEWER'S REPORT

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.

- Who is the main customer / user for this application?
- Why does the user / customer benefit from the application, when the application shows the values after the machine has been already built and the motor has been already selected/bought?
- How does an increase of the motor speed influence its load curve?
- What is the benefit / difference of edge vs. cloud computing?

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

Date: **21.6.2021**

Signature: