REVIEWER'S FORM
for thesis evaluation

1. Identification of the student

Student:	Shunli You
Thesis:	Structural survey of historical Building Strahovska Fara in Pohořelec
1st Institution:	UPC Barcelona
2nd Institution:	Czech Technical University in Prague
Academic year:	2016/2017

2. Identification of the reviewer

Name:	Ing. Kristýna Michalová
Institution:	Czech Technical University in Prague
Position:	doctoral student

3. Fulfillment of thesis goals

excellent ☐   above aver. x   average ☐   below aver. ☐   weak ☐

Comments:

The primary goals were to characterize the structure by its materials, find out mechanisms of their decay, evaluate the damage using accessible methods of study and asses the concept of conservation and further maintenance. All the goals were achieved in comparable above average quality.

4. Academic/scientific/technical quality

excellent ☐   above aver. x   average ☐   below aver. ☐   weak ☐

Comments:

Shinli You proves his ability to understand the professional literature and apply it for practical solutions. In some parts - especially in description of intervention proposals, there are missing detailed explanation of principles (however it seems that the principles are understood). Some information seems too simplified.

5. Formal arrangement of the thesis and level of language

excellent ☐   above aver. x   average ☐   below aver. ☐   weak ☐

Comments:

The document is well written and structured with some minor terminological inaccuracies. Formal arrangement is due to this aim and meets all requirements. The structuring of the text corresponds to the theoretical nature of the thesis. Images and tables are clearly presented including also flow charts. Results are well arranged into tables.

6. Further comments

Some points to be discussed:

- How to protect the structures against biodeterioration?

The thesis is fulfilling the given tasks above the standard level and has parameters of a professional report. I recommend the thesis for the defense.

7. Grade: B very good

Use the following scale

A (excellent)	B (very good)	C (good)	D (satisfactory)	E (sufficient)	F (fail)

Prague

July 10, 2017

The Reviewer,

_____

Kristýna Michalová