

## I. IDENTIFICATION DATA

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Thesis title:</b>            | <b>Experimental stand for observation of a suspension flow in a pipe</b>       |
| <b>Author name:</b>             | <b>Harish Balakrishnan</b>   |
| <b>Type of thesis :</b>         | master   |
| <b>Faculty/Institute:</b>       | Faculty of Mechanical Engineering (FME)  |
| <b>Department:</b>              | Department of Process Engineering  |
| <b>Thesis supervisor:</b>       | Ing. Jiří Moravec, Ph.D.   |
| <b>Supervisor's department:</b> | CTU in Prague, Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, Dept. of Process Engineering |

## II. EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA

|   |                               |
|---|-------------------------------|
| <b>Assignment</b>   | <b>ordinarily challenging</b> |
| <i>How demanding was the assigned project?</i>  |                               |
| The main goal of the work was to design an experimental stand that would enable to observe behavior and properties of a suspension during its flow in a pipe. The proposal of the stand should have contained all the necessary parts, including sensors that are suitable for measuring the velocity, temperature, and concentration profiles in the flow. Therefore, a review of the literature on the state of the art in the field of measuring methods had to be included. |                               |

|  |                  |
|--|------------------|
| <b>Fulfilment of assignment</b>  | <b>fulfilled</b> |
| <i>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?</i> |                  |
| The student completed all the tasks.   |                  |

|  |                      |
|--|----------------------|
| <b>Activity and independence when creating final thesis</b>  | <b>A - excellent</b> |
| <i>Assess whether the student had a positive approach, whether the time limits were met, whether the conception was regularly consulted and whether the student was well prepared for the consultations. Assess the student's ability to work independently.</i> |                      |
| The student worked independently and with a positive approach. Particular parts of the work have been consulted on an ongoing basis. The work was done in time.  |                      |

|  |                      |
|--|----------------------|
| <b>Technical level</b>   | <b>B - very good</b> |
| <i>How well did the student employ expertise in his/her field of study? Does the student explain clearly what he/she has done?</i>   |                      |
| The technical level of the thesis should be evaluated by a reviewer of the thesis. From my point of view as a supervisor, the student needed just a little help with some of the calculations, and thus the technical level was very good. |                      |

|   |                      |
|---|----------------------|
| <b>Formal level and language level, scope of thesis</b>   | <b>B - very good</b> |
| <i>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?</i> |                      |
| The format level of the thesis presented by the student was quite good. The language, however, needed more corrections before the final submission.   |                      |

## 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.*

If I summarize all the criteria for the evaluation of the quality of the thesis and the author's work, I recommend that the thesis be awarded by the grade

**B - very good.**

Date: **27.1.2022**

Signature: Jiří Moravec  
m.p.