

BACHELOR THESIS PEER REVIEW

I. PERSONAL AND STUDY DETAILS

Student's name: Yusifov Tamerlan Tahir Oglu Personal ID number: 487626

Faculty: Faculty of Biomedical Engineering
Study program: Biomedical and Clinical Technology

Branch of study: **Biomedical Technician**

II. EVALUATION OF THE BACHELOR THESIS

Comparison of antenna elements by using a virtual model of a real patient					
	Evaluation criteria	N. of point			
1.	Fulfillment of the aim of the thesis and suitability of the structure of the thesis with respect to the topic (compliance with the assignment). $(0 - 30)$ *	30			
	Any part or sentence of the bachelor thesis assignment has to be dealt with. The full amount of points can be given to the excellent thesis only. The points are reduced in relation to the part of the assignment which is not properly dealt with or is not included at all.				
2.	Theoretical level and application of accessible sources. (0 – 30)*				
	The reader evaluates the relevance of the theoretical part of the thesis with respect to the assignment and structuring of the ideas. If word-for-word citing prevails, the reader shall decrease the rating by 15 points. (of course if copyright is abided). Moreover, another reason for decreasing the overall assessment is insufficient amount of theoretical knowledge, references and sources.				
3.	Scope of experimental work (SW, HW) and applied knowledge, quality of methodology and conclusions of the thesis. (0 - 30)*	20			
	Maximum number of points can be granted to a thesis which is fit for publishing. This aspect is judged with respect to enhancement of theoretical knowledge and practical implications. Creation of a model, SW or technical realization is valued. For minor methodological flaws, the assessment is reduced by up to 5 points. Inconsistency of elaboration with the theoretical background and unclear or not fully professional approach leads to a reduction by at least 15 points. Another decrease can be due to insufficient discussion. A total of 30 points can be given to a very complex and flawless work, including other activities such as participation in scientific-research project or grant, active participation in the writing publications, patents and utility models.				
1.	Formal requisites and layout of the thesis (writing mastery, structuring, graphs, tables, citations in the text, list of references etc.). $(0 - 10)^*$	2			
	Reader evaluates formal requisites according to the rules of writing, attributes of final works, i.e. text formatting, structure of the text, references, quality of charts and tables and citations. Number of points can be reduced for noncompliance with the rules by the maximum of 2 points for each disrespected attribute. Grammatical mistakes, spelling mistakes and improper stylistics and terminology decrease the evaluation by 2-4 points. Only standard terminology should be used, especially in the English language (it is necessary to judge the ability to use the technical language - 2 points), graph are according to the rules (see tolerance and the influence of statistical processing - 2 points), captions are included for graphs and tables and everything is readable (2 points), citation rules are complied with according to ISO690 and ISO690-2 (2 points).				
5.	Total points	72			

III. PROPOSED QUESTIONS FOR THE DEFENSE (OPTIONAL)

- 1. On page 15 you are writing, that metamaterial antenna is widely used. In what hyperthermia system the metamaterial antenna has been already used and what results were achieved?
- 2. Could any optimization algorithm be utilized to find out the best amount of power being deliver by any of the antenna in the system?
- 3. Are there any ways how to reduce the hotspots on the surface of the phantoms and so deliver more power inside of the body?

IV. THE OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE LEVEL OF THE BACHELOR THESIS

Grade**:	A (excellent)	B (very good)	C (good)	D (satisfactory)	E (sufficient)	F (failed)
Number of points:	100 - 90	89 - 80	79 - 70	69 - 60	59 - 50	< 50
			Х			

^{**} in case of F (failed) please explain in detail

I give the above grade to the bachelor thesis and I recommend/do not recommend it for the defence.

V. COMMENTS

The main aims of the thesis are fulfilled. Interesting comparison of antennas for hyperthermia is presented. However, the compared antennas are not very well described and the presentation of achieved results is not always clear. Present typing errors make reading of the work difficult. Subchapters are not numbered. In Declaration, there is mentioned name of different work - but that is just copy paste error and it may happen. I am also missing images of SAR for metamaterial antenna.

Name and surname incl. degrees: Ing. Ilja Merunka, Ph.D.	Signature:
Institution:	
Contact address:	Date: