FACULTY
OF INFORMATION
TECHNOLOGY
CTU IN PRAGUE

Review report of a final thesis

Reviewer:	Ing. Jiří Hunka
Student:	Abdullah Abdullah
Thesis title:	Web portal for EFB
Branch / specialization:	Web and Software Engineering
Created on:	January 31, 2022

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 assignment is fulfilled with objections.
The first objection concerns insufficient user testing - details in the second chapter of this report.
The second objection concerns an unclear source of information in the analysis. The reader does not know, how the author obtained information about requirements (methodology, source of information, etc).
The final objection concerns an insufficient analysis of competing solutions. Autor does not define any goals and makes a very superficial and short analysis.

2. Main written part 52 /100 (E)

I can't assess the language side well enough, but in terms of content, the work is rather below average. From my point of view, the reader is not getting acquainted enough with the necessary information regarding the analysis. User testing is not sufficiently documented. There are no test records. The number of testers is not enough. The presented usability test cannot be called a usability test. It is not entirely clear whether the author was present in his own usability test, or in what form it was made. The bibliography does not conform to current standards. Functional and non-functional requirements are not structured according to teaching. Other partial problems also reduce the quality of the text.

3. Non-written part, attachments   80 /100 (B)

The application looks to be working and fulfills its purpose. It is a simple application but fulfills the task.
One of the mistakes I noticed was if the user makes a mistake in filling out, for example, the Holiday Request, he will only find this out after submitting the form. It will lose all filled and unsaved data. The next mistake, for example, was when I changed my password, I still had to log in using my old password - it could have been my own fault, but I tried twice with the same result.

4. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards   80 /100 (B)

The result is fully usable. But I think that it is replaceable with existing solutions. However, this does not question the usability of the result.

The overall evaluation   61 /100 (D)

The final evaluation is based on the previous parts of the report. The author performed software development according to the assignment. The author's claims in the text are often contradictory, and the overall argumentation is weak. The factual part of the thesis text is rather bad.
Therefore, I propose an evaluation grade of D.

Questions for the defense

1. How did you collect the requirements for your solution?
2. How many coverage tests does your implementation have? You listed more than 100 units tests, but what is the coverage of the entire implementation?
3. Do you know what Nielsen's curve is? What is the optimal number of testers for usability testing? Why do you only have two? And how did you observe the testers during testing?

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. 52/2021, 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.

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.