REVIEWER'S OPINION OF FINAL THESIS

ČVUT ČESKÉ VYSOKÉ UČENÍ TECHNICKÉ V PRAZE

I. IDENTIFICATION DATA

Thesis name:	**A Modern Wiki Web application based on User Centered Design method**
Author's name:	**Marek Dlugoš**
Type of thesis :	bachelor
Faculty/Institute:	Faculty of Electrical Engineering (FEE)
Department:	Dept. of Computer Science
Thesis reviewer:	Martin Králik
Reviewer's department:	Facebook, London, United Kingdom

II. EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA

Assignment	**challenging**

Evaluation of thesis difficulty of assignment.

This was a complex assignment consisting of five different sections. Each of these sections had nontrivial scope and required different skillset to achieve: user interviewing, research, visual design, architecture design and writing the actual code.

Satisfaction of assignment	**fulfilled**

Assess that handed thesis meets assignment. Present points of assignment that fell short or were extended. Try to assess importance, impact or cause of each shortcoming.

The assignment was fulfilled.

I have one remark here: The list of prepared wireframes was very comprehensive, but was missing page editing one. Which I believe is one of the important flows for each wiki.

Method of conception	**correct**

Assess that student has chosen correct approach or solution methods.

The chosen approach was right in general.

I really liked that:

- The wireframing was sped up by using a correct tool. Which was also explained in the thesis.
- The student realized a project like this can grow out of scope and did a prioritization of potential features to prevent this.

There were some parts that could've been improved:

- The characteristics picked by the student were not informed by the user survey (page 9). That is a missed opportunity for features, since it is hard to tell in advance if users will really value "search" or "fast deployment".
- There were many reasons listed why Ruby on Rail was chosen (pages 29-30). It would be great to highlight which was the key factor.
- Why is familiarity with existing Android system design something to avoid (page 34)? It sounds like it could still fullfil our needs (as long as it's fresh and modern).

Technical level	**B - very good.**

Assess level of thesis specialty, use of knowledge gained by study and by expert literature, use of sources and data gained by experience.

The student guided his choices and method by the researched information. This was great.

I also liked the reached conclusion that people from differently sized organizations have different needs and the future work will be more successful if we focus just on companies of one size.

However, there were few cases where technical aspects were mentioned and it was not clear why:
- It's not clear in what way or why "webpack support pays off in the long run" (page 30)
- It's not clear why the devise_aes_encryptable Devis extensions is worth mentioning (page 43)

Formal and language level, scope of thesis	C - good.
Assess correctness of usage of formal notation. Assess typographical and language arrangement of thesis.	

The thesis was easy to read.

The chapter on implementation decisions appears as a collection of loosely connected sections. It would be great to give it a more structure. This could be done by stating in advance what are the important implementation decisions to be made. And by grouping together everything database related – similarly how security related decisions are grouped.

The citation 21 on page 33 is problematic: The section it is used in is about ElasticSearch as a whole, but the cited text is about another software that uses ElasticSearch. That makes it unclear which of them actually provides the mentioned features.

The work contains a couple of other minor issues (the labels on the right side of the figure 6.5 mention colors which don't appear on the corresponding left hand, spelling error "throw" on page 74).

It wasn't clear if usage of Ruby on Rails was part of the assignment or not. On one hand, the list of recommended literature contains two books on this framework. On the other hand, the thesis contains a section on why RoR.

Selection of sources, citation correctness	A - excellent.
Present your opinion to student's activity when obtaining and using study materials for thesis creation. Characterize selection of sources. Assess that student used all relevant sources. Verify that all used elements are correctly distinguished from own results and thoughts. Assess that citation ethics has not been breached and that all bibliographic citations are complete and in accordance with citation convention and standards.	

I had no problems distinguishing between student's thoughts and their sources.

Additional commentary and evaluation
Present your opinion to achieved primary goals of thesis, e.g. level of theoretical results, level and functionality of technical or software conception, publication performance, experimental dexterity etc.

III. OVERALL EVALUATION, QUESTIONS FOR DEFENSE, CLASSIFICATION SUGGESTION

Summarize thesis aspects that swayed your final evaluation. Please present apt questions which student should answer during defense.

This thesis nicely shows how user centered development can be used to create a new wiki software.
The process consists of several diverse stages, each of which required the author to acquire and use a different kind of skill.
The overall result is solid. Statements that were missing justification or further explanation were the main shortcoming.

The future of development section talks about plan to create "reactive user interface". I'd like to hear why this is a desirable path to take. Does it stem from user research or the assignment?

I evaluate handed thesis with classification grade **B - very good.**

Date: **3.6.2019**   Signature: