Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

Student: Andrey Babushkin
Supervisor: Ing. Stanislav Kuznetsov
Thesis title: Market signal algorithm based on image recognition
Branch of the study: Knowledge Engineering

Date: 18. 6. 2019

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.
1. Fulfilment of the assignment	**_1 = assignment fulfilled,_** _2 = assignment fulfilled with minor objections,_ _3 = assignment fulfilled with major objections,_ _4 = assignment not fulfilled_

Criteria description:
Assess whether the submitted FT defines the objectives sufficiently and in line with the assignment; whether the objectives are formulated correctly and fulfilled sufficiently.
In the comment, specify the points of the assignment that have not been met, assess the severity, impact, and, if appropriate, also the cause of the deficiencies. If the assignment differs substantially from the standards for the FT or if the student has developed the FT beyond the assignment, describe the way it got reflected on the quality of the assignment's fulfilment and the way it affected your final evaluation.

Comments:
The submitted FT fulfils the objectives. Student shows the ability to the developed robust system for predict cryptocurrency behaviour on cryptomarket. I very much appreciate the fact that the student has proven himself with such an uneasy anchor. The results are not some hight, but the whole architecture of the system has shown an interesting direction.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
2. Main written part	*80 (B)*

Criteria description:
Evaluate whether the extent of the FT is adequate to its content and scope: are all the parts of the FT contentful and necessary? Next, consider whether the submitted FT is actually correct – are there factual errors or inaccuracies? Evaluate the logical structure of the FT, the thematic flow between chapters and whether the text is comprehensible to the reader. Assess whether the formal notations in the FT are used correctly. Assess the typographic and language aspects of the FT, follow the Dean's Directive No. 26/2017, Art. 3. Evaluate whether the relevant sources are properly used, quoted and cited. Verify that all quotes are properly distinguished from the results achieved in the FT, thus, that the citation ethics has not been violated and that the citations are complete and in accordance with citation practices and standards. Finally, evaluate whether the software and other copyrighted works have been used in accordance with their license terms.

Comments:
The submitted FT is written more in science way than the traditional thesis. Is rather short but contains all the requisite passages, based on which, the reader can understand the problem. There's a couple of misspellings and grammar errors, but the student is a not native speaker, so it's understandable.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
3. Non-written part, attachments	*95 (A)*

Criteria description:
Depending on the nature of the FT, comment on the non-written part of the thesis. For example: SW work – the overall quality of the program. Is the technology used (from the development to deployment) suitable and adequate? HW – functional sample. Evaluate the technology and tools used. Research and experimental work – repeatability of the experiment.

Comments:
The code is clean and responds to today's standards. It's all well documented. It shows that the student has several years of experience in software development

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
4. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards	*90 (A)*

Criteria description:
Depending on the nature of the thesis, estimate whether the thesis results could be deployed in practice; alternatively, evaluate whether the results of the FT extend the already published/known results or whether they bring in completely new findings.

Comments:
The final program is the great baseline for future works, although the main result is not so high. It shows an interesting direction for future work.
The whole project is very modularly, so it is not a big issue to modify exists modules and add the new one.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 1 to 5.
5. Activity and self-reliance of the student	5a: _**1 = excellent activity,**_ _2 = very good activity,_ _3 = average activity,_ _4 = weaker, but still sufficient activity,_ _5 = insufficient activity_ 5b: _**1 = excellent self-reliance,**_ _2 = very good self-reliance,_ _3 = average self-reliance,_ _4 = weaker, but still sufficient self-reliance,_ _5 = insufficient self-reliance._

Criteria description:
From your experience with the course of the work on the thesis and its outcome, review the student's activity while working on the thesis, his/her punctuality when meeting the deadlines and whether he/she consulted you as he/she went along and also, whether he/she was well prepared for these consultations (5a). Assess the student's ability to develop independent creative work (5b).

Comments:
The student was very reliable in delivering as well as joining in discussions and regularly coming to consult his progress.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
6. The overall evaluation	_95 (A)_

Criteria description:
Summarize which of the aspects of the FT affected your grading process the most. The overall grade does not need to be an arithmetic mean (or other value) calculated from the evaluation in the previous criteria. Generally, a well-fulfilled assignment is assessed by grade A.

Comments:
Overall, I'm pleased with the student's work. The student worked alone, researching existing solutions, and then developing an interesting solution that will continue to improve in the future. 95 A

Signature of the supervisor: