

# Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

Czech Technical University in Prague

Faculty of Information Technology

**Student:** Ing. Timur Tatarshaov  
**Supervisor:** Ing. Josef Gattermayer  
**Thesis title:** Mobile application and API server to store points of interest  
**Branch of the study:** Web and Software Engineering (Master, in Czech and in English)

**Date:** 1. 6. 2015

<p><i>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p><b>1. Difficulty and other comments on the assignment</b></p> <p><i>Criteria description:</i> Characterize this final thesis in detail and its relationships to previous or current projects. Comment what is difficult about this thesis (in case of a more difficult thesis, you may overlook some shortcomings that you would not in case of an easy assignment, and on the contrary, with an easy assignment those shortcomings should be evaluated more strictly.)</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The aim of the thesis was to create a mobile app and a server.</p>	<p><i>The evaluation scale: 1 to 5.</i></p> <p><b>1 = extremely challenging assignment,</b> <b>2 = rather difficult assignment,</b> <b>3 = assignment of average difficulty,</b> <b>4 = easier, but still sufficient assignment,</b> <b>5 = insufficient assignment</b></p>
<p><i>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p><b>2. Fulfilment of the assignment</b></p> <p><i>Criteria description:</i> Assess whether the thesis meets the assignment statement. In Comments indicate parts of the assignment that have not been fulfilled, completely or partially, or extensions of the thesis beyond the original assignment. If the assignment was not completely fulfilled, try to assess the importance, impact, and possibly also the reason of the insufficiencies.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> All technical points successfully completed.</p>	<p><i>The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.</i></p> <p><b>1 = assignment fulfilled,</b> <b>2 = assignment fulfilled with minor objections,</b> <b>3 = assignment fulfilled with major objections,</b> <b>4 = assignment not fulfilled</b></p>
<p><i>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p><b>3. Size of the main written part</b></p> <p><i>Criteria description:</i> Evaluate the adequacy of the extent of the final thesis, considering its content and the size of the written part, i.e. that all parts of the thesis are rich on information and the text does not contain unnecessary parts.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The thesis is 49 pages long, but I consider it still as an acceptable minimum for implementation thesis.</p>	<p><i>The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.</i></p> <p><b>1 = meets the criteria,</b> <b>2 = meets the criteria with minor objections,</b> <b>3 = meets the criteria with major objections,</b> <b>4 = does not meet the criteria</b></p>
<p><i>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p><b>4. Factual and logical level of the thesis</b></p> <p><i>Criteria description:</i> Assess whether the thesis is correct as to the facts or if there are factual errors and inaccuracies. Evaluate further the logical structure of the thesis, links among the chapters, and the comprehensibility of the text for a reader.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> No problem.</p>	<p><i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i></p> <p><b>100 (A)</b></p>
<p><i>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p><b>5. Formal level of the thesis</b></p> <p><i>Criteria description:</i> Assess the correctness of formalisms used in the thesis, the typographical and linguistic aspects, see Dean's Directive No. 12/2014, Article 3.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The language quality of the text is very poor. There is a number of mistakes in almost every paragraph. Most of the are missing articles, missing verbs and wrong syntax. I ask the commission to check this, I'm not sure how if the thesis meets minimal formal requirements.</p>	<p><i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i></p> <p><b>49 (F)</b></p>
<p><i>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p><b>6. Bibliography</b></p> <p><i>Criteria description:</i> Evaluate the student's activity in acquisition and use of studying materials in his thesis. Characterize the choice of the sources. Discuss whether the student used all relevant sources, or whether he tried to solve problems that were already solved. Verify that all elements taken from other sources are properly differentiated from his own results and contributions. Comment if there was a possible violation of the citation ethics and if the bibliographical references are complete and in compliance with citation standards.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> There are only 9 resources and citations are barely used.</p>	<p><i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i></p> <p><b>51 (E)</b></p>

<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i>
<b>7. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards</b>	<b>90 (A)</b>
<i>Criteria description:</i> Comment on the achieved level of major results of the thesis and indicate whether the main results of the thesis extend published state-of-the-art results and/or bring completely new findings. Assess the quality and functionality of hardware or software solutions. Alternatively, evaluate whether the software or source code that was not created by the student himself was used in accordance with the license terms and copyright. Comment on possible publication output or awards related to the thesis.	
<i>Comments:</i> No problem.	
<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>No evaluation scale.</i>
<b>8. Applicability of the results</b>	
<i>Criteria description:</i> Indicate the potential of using the results of the thesis in practice.	
<i>Comments:</i> The thesis can server as a good basis of a startup project.	
<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 1 to 5.</i>
<b>9. Activity and self-reliance of the student</b>	9a: 1 = excellent activity, <b>2 = very good activity,</b> 3 = average activity, 4 = weaker, but still sufficient activity, 5 = insufficient activity 9b: <b>1 = excellent self-reliance,</b> 2 = very good self-reliance, 3 = average self-reliance, 4 = weaker, but still sufficient self-reliance, 5 = insufficient self-reliance.
<i>Criteria description:</i> Review student's activity while working on this final thesis, student's punctuality when meeting the deadlines and consulting continuously and also, student's preparedness for these consultations. Furthermore, review student's independency.	
<i>Comments:</i> The student is very self-motivated.	
<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i>
<b>10. The overall evaluation</b>	<b>70 (C)</b>
<i>Criteria description:</i> Summarize the parts of the thesis that had major impact on your evaluation. The overall evaluation <b>does not</b> have to be the arithmetic mean or any other formula with the values from the previous evaluation criteria 1 to 9.	
<i>Comments:</i> The analysis is the strongest part of the thesis, it provides a great overview of current technologies. All decisions are well argued, the implementation is made according to the best industry standards. The structure of the thesis is logical, covers all requirements. I have no doubts about strong technical skills of the author.  However, the formal part of the thesis is very poor. The biggest problem is the level of grammar, there are mistakes in almost every paragraph. I recommend the commission to compare this thesis with other accepted theses in English if it meets minimal faculty criteria.	

Signature of the supervisor: