



Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

Supervisor: Ing. Jan Trávníček, Ph.D.
Student: Marek Fořt
Thesis title: Finite automata editor on touch devices
Branch / specialization: Computer Science
Created on: 7 June 2021

Evaluation criteria

1. Fulfillment of the assignment

- ▶ [1] assignment fulfilled
- [2] assignment fulfilled with minor objections
- [3] assignment fulfilled with major objections
- [4] assignment not fulfilled

The thesis goal was to study the current Algorithms Library Toolkit's web interface and implement a finite automata editor for a touch device, which is a sub-module of the web interface. The student was also asked to perform usability tests of the final interface. The assignment is of medium complexity and I state that it was fulfilled completely.

2. Main written part

85 / 100 (B)

The thesis is written in very good and easy to read English. I didn't find any notable issues with the text, except for occasional missing articles and occasional deviation from the usual word ordering in English.

In general, the text sections contain relevant information and no too important pieces of information are missing. Still, I would appreciate a bit more on the topic of Machine Learning in the chapter Theory. On the other hand, the theory of grammars is not important for the rest of the text.

From the typography point of view:

- the text consistently uses a hyphen instead of a dash.
- too long paragraphs sometimes appear in the text.
- use of e.g. in the middle of a sentence does not look natural to me.
- code snippet 3.1 has its label and content split with a page break.

3. Non-written part, attachments

100 /100 (A)

A non-written part of the thesis is a finite automata editor. As far as I can tell, the implementation is working, its functionality is covered with unit tests and usability testing was carried out as well.

4. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards

100 /100 (A)

As with the web interface for ALT, the finite automata editor may be the first step in the creation of a complete interface for ALT on touch devices in the future.

5. Activity of the student

- ▶ [1] excellent activity
- [2] very good activity
- [3] average activity
- [4] weaker, but still sufficient activity
- [5] insufficient activity

The student was very active and the implementation was practically completely implemented few weeks prior to submission.

6. Self-reliance of the student

- ▶ [1] excellent self-reliance
- [2] very good self-reliance
- [3] average self-reliance
- [4] weaker, but still sufficient self-reliance
- [5] insufficient self-reliance

The student was very self-reliant. We have consulted details of the implementation mostly.

The overall evaluation

95 /100 (A)

There are some issues in the text of the thesis. On the other hand, the implementation is of very high quality. I recommend the thesis for defence and I recommend evaluating it with 95 points, i.e., grade A (excellent),

Instructions

Fulfillment of the assignment

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.

Main written part

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.

Non-written part, attachments

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.

Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards

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.

Activity of the student

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.

Self-reliance of the student

From your experience with the course of the work on the thesis and its outcome, assess the student's ability to develop independent creative work.

The overall evaluation

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.