SUPERVISOR´S EVALUATION
OF DIPLOMA THESIS

I. IDENTIFICATION DATA

Title:	Drying of biomass with high water content
Author:	Bc. Pavel Kovařík
Type of thesis:	Master´s
Faculty/department:	Faculty of Mechanical Engineering
Department:	Department of Energy Engineering
Supervisor:	Ing. Jan Havlík
Supervisor´s place of employment:	FME, CTU in Prague

II. EVALUATION CRITERIONS

Diploma thesis assignment   **Medium**

Difficulty evaluation of the diploma thesis assignment.

Difficulty of the assignment corresponds with the level of diploma thesis.

Fulfilment of thesis´s assignment   **Fulfilled**

Evaluate, whether the proposed final work fulfils the assignment. Comment where appropriate, points of reference that were not fully met, or if the work is extended compared to assignment. If the assignment is also not completely fulfilled, try to assess the importance, impact and possibly cause various deficiencies.

The proposed final work fulfils the assignment. The student made this work in accordance with the principles for its elaboration and fulfilled all points of the work assignment.

Activity and independence during thesis´s processing   **B–Very good**

Evaluate whether the student was active during thesis´s processing, whether he respected specific deadlines, if his solution was continuously consulted and whether he was sufficiently prepared for consultations. Consider the student's ability to work independently and creatively.

The student respected pre-arranged schedule during thesis's processing and regularly consulted progress in the solution. Despite some minor objections, the activity was sufficient considering the complexity of the drying topic.

Professional level   **B–Very good**

Assess the expertise level of thesis, using knowledge gained from the study of scientific literature, documentation and utilization of data obtained from practice.

Appropriate literary sources were used for the solution. The computational part and the dryer design part are well managed according to recommended literature, but the process should be better explained. The results should be elaborated in more detail. There are many small inaccuracies and mistakes, which do not affect the results of this work, but decrease its level.

Formal and language level   **C–Good**

Assess formal correctness in the bibliography, the typographical and linguistic aspects of thesis.

Bibliography and linguistic aspects are at an appropriate level. The computational part is less clear, which makes difficult the orientation in the calculation procedure. In general, the graphical level could be at a higher level.

Bibliography   **B–Very good**

Comment the student's activity during the acquisition and use of learning materials to solve thesis. Characterize the selection of sources. Assess whether the student made use of all relevant sources. Verify that adopted information is properly distinguished from student´s results and considerations, whether citation forms are correspond with ethics, whether bibliographic citations are complete and finally whether all citation are in accordance with the practices and standards.

The student used available sources in sufficient extent. The citation of these sources corresponds with the usual standard.

Other comments
Comment the level achieved major results of the final work, e.g. the level of theoretical results, or the functional level of technical solutions, publication outlets, experimental skills, etc.
Regarding to the complexity of problematics of fuel drying, the student managed the work solution very well. Graphics processing and greater clarity of the work should be improved to better result. The computational part and the design of the dryer should be processed in more detail.

III. FINAL EVALUATION AND PROPOSAL OF CLASSIFICATION

Summarize aspects of the thesis that most influenced your final evaluation.

The student fulfils the objectives of the thesis assignment. He regularly consulted about processing the work in accordance with the pre-arranged schedule. The research part was made with using sufficient number of literature. The experimental part including analysis of experiments was managed very well. The computational part and the dryer design were made in very good level, but there is still a potential to improve the solution by a more detailed elaboration. Regarding to the complexity of problematics of fuel drying, the student processed the work very well. More initiative in work processing and a better layout were missing for better final result. There are several details which could be improved. These details in the overall effect reduce the level of the final work.

I evaluate the submitted final work by   **B - very good**

Date: 27.1.2017   Signature: