FACULTY
OF INFORMATION
TECHNOLOGY
CTU IN PRAGUE

Review report of a final thesis

Reviewer:	Ing. Jan Blizničenko
Student:	Jamaladdin Azizov
Thesis title:	ExpenseTracker - personal finance manager
Branch / specialization:	Web and Software Engineering
Created on:	26 August 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 goal of the thesis was to implement application for managing personal finance. Although the assignment itself does not mention it, only backend was aim of this thesis. All parts of the assignment are fulfilled, although some lack proper quality.

2. Main written part

70 / 100 (C)

The thesis contains all the important information with acceptable structure. This application is based on its previous version described by student. Although the student describes all its implemented functions and states there are issues with it, he does not describe what the issues are and what is missing.
Regarding design, although used technologies are listed and described, there is no reasoning behind it and not much of comparison with alternatives.
Student uses multiple diagram considered UML ones, although there are some problems like missing multiplicities in class diagrams or sequence diagram used as combination of some abstract concepts not included in the code and less important details like object destruction.
The implementation chapter is quite vague in many aspects, like missing description of functionality implemented on database side.
Bibliography contains 26 items, yet most of them are links to technologies used - to index pages of their websites or their Github pages.
The language part is quite good, especially considering the student is presumably not a native English speaker.

3. Non-written part, attachments 75 /100 (C)

The result of the non-written part is a fully working backend of the application. Student provided the implementation itself with its tests, OpenAPI yaml file and installation instructions. However, any other form of documentation is not included and multiple parts of its code are quite hard to understand due to poor structure.

4. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards 75 /100 (C)

The resulting application seems to be functional and able to serve its purpose, although it is hard to fully evaluate its completeness and proper behavior without a frontend part.

The overall evaluation 72 /100 (C)

The written part lacks many needed details, UML diagrams have multiple issues and non written part lacks proper documentation. However, all the requirements are fulfilled and the resulting implementation seems to be working well.

Questions for the defense

What were the issues with the previous version of the application, mentioned in the written part?
What exactly do SQL triggers added through migrations do?

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. 52/2021, 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.