



Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

Supervisor: prof. Dr. Ing. Petr Kroha, CSc.
Student: Vigneshwar Manoharan
Thesis title: Using Neo4j DB system to store and query linguistic pattern
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 completely fulfilled.

2. Main written part 89 /100 (B)

The thesis is elaborated very carefully in every detail. Its extent is greater than expected. However, it contains many parts that are not completely related to the main topic of the thesis. The text is written in very good English and contains only some small mistakes, e.g., missing spaces for (on many places, grammatical methods vs grammatical structures (page 1), system, Additionally vs system. Additionally (page 10), bolt vs. Bolt protocol (page 32), dissertation vs thesis (page 46), etc. Some citations are not cited precisely or are not complete.

3. Non-written part, attachments 89 /100 (B)

The graphical part is very accurate and contains all diagrams and schemata concerning the design phase. The developed programs of the implementation have been tested and documented. The bibliography is impressive. However, code samples are not numbered, which makes them difficult to follow

4. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards 89 /100 (B)

The thesis is about the interface implementation between the graph database system Neo4J and our tool TEMOS. The task of the database is to store linguistic patterns used in

our tool TEMOS, whose purpose is to test the quality of textual requirements specification. The assignment has been fulfilled.

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 visited our meetings every week. He was always prepared.

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 needed some help and explanations.

The overall evaluation

89 /100 (B)

Very good and carefully prepared work of an implementation nature.

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.

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.