

Review report of a final thesis

Czech Technical University in Prague

Faculty of Information Technology

Student: Ing. Timur Tatarshaov
Reviewer: Ing. Milan Dojčinovski
Thesis title: Mobile application and API server to store points of interest
Branch of the study: Web and Software Engineering (Master, in Czech and in English)

Date: 1. 6. 2015

<p><i>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p>1. Difficulty and other comments on the assignment</p> <p><i>Criteria description:</i> Characterize this final thesis in detail and its relationships to previous or current projects. Comment what is difficult about this thesis (in case of a more difficult thesis, you may overlook some shortcomings that you would not in case of an easy assignment, and on the contrary, with an easy assignment those shortcomings should be evaluated more strictly.)</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The main goal of the thesis is to implement a mobile application for manipulation with point of interests. The core component of the application is a REST API. Considering the expected outputs, it is an average difficult task.</p>	<p><i>The evaluation scale: 1 to 5.</i> 1 = extremely challenging assignment, 2 = rather difficult assignment, 3 = assignment of average difficulty, 4 = easier, but still sufficient assignment, 5 = insufficient assignment</p>
<p><i>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p>2. Fulfilment of the assignment</p> <p><i>Criteria description:</i> Assess whether the thesis meets the assignment statement. In Comments indicate parts of the assignment that have not been fulfilled, completely or partially, or extensions of the thesis beyond the original assignment. If the assignment was not completely fulfilled, try to assess the importance, impact, and possibly also the reason of the insufficiencies.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The assignments have been fulfilled, however, with major objections. Individual parts of the thesis such as (requirements analysis, design, and testing) have not been well worked out.</p>	<p><i>The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.</i> 1 = assignment fulfilled, 2 = assignment fulfilled with minor objections, 3 = assignment fulfilled with major objections, 4 = assignment not fulfilled</p>
<p><i>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p>3. Size of the main written part</p> <p><i>Criteria description:</i> Evaluate the adequacy of the extent of the final thesis, considering its content and the size of the written part, i.e. that all parts of the thesis are rich on information and the text does not contain unnecessary parts.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The written part fulfils the requirements with the following objections: the abstract is very short, the work could be better motivated, the length of the thesis almost reaches its minimum - 50 pages. The student also had to provide analysis of the state-of-the-art applications similar to the one developed. Such information is not found in the thesis.</p>	<p><i>The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.</i> 1 = meets the criteria, 2 = meets the criteria with minor objections, 3 = meets the criteria with major objections, 4 = does not meet the criteria</p>
<p><i>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p>4. Factual and logical level of the thesis</p> <p><i>Criteria description:</i> Assess whether the thesis is correct as to the facts or if there are factual errors and inaccuracies. Evaluate further the logical structure of the thesis, links among the chapters, and the comprehensibility of the text for a reader.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The requirements are not well structured. The API is not well described - a data model diagram could be used to describe the API resource model. The design and realization part could be an individual chapters - currently there is no clear separation. Some parts of the thesis are difficult to understand. However, the rest of the thesis is well structured.</p>	<p><i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i> 65 (D)</p>
<p><i>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p>5. Formal level of the thesis</p> <p><i>Criteria description:</i> Assess the correctness of formalisms used in the thesis, the typographical and linguistic aspects, see Dean's Directive No. 12/2014, Article 3.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> In general, the typographic and linguistic aspects are good with few objections: number of typographical and grammatical errors have been noticed and some paragraphs contain only one sentence.</p>	<p><i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i> 73 (C)</p>
<p><i>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p>6. Bibliography</p>	<p><i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i> 51 (E)</p>

Criteria description:

Evaluate the student's activity in acquisition and use of studying materials in his thesis. Characterize the choice of the sources. Discuss whether the student used all relevant sources, or whether he tried to solve problems that were already solved. Verify that all elements taken from other sources are properly differentiated from his own results and contributions. Comment if there was a possible violation of the citation ethics and if the bibliographical references are complete and in compliance with citation standards.

Comments:

Used literature and references are good with some major objections: very few references (only 9), in some references is missing information (ISBN), citing general webpages (iOS). Also, on several places are missing citations for standards (SOAP, WSDL, OAuth, SSL) and figures citations (Fig. 1.4).

Evaluation criterion:

The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).

7. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards

75 (C)

Criteria description:

Comment on the achieved level of major results of the thesis and indicate whether the main results of the thesis extend published state-of-the-art results and/or bring completely new findings. Assess the quality and functionality of hardware or software solutions. Alternatively, evaluate whether the software or source code that was not created by the student himself was used in accordance with the license terms and copyright. Comment on possible publication output or awards related to the thesis.

Comments:

The main result is an API and a simple Web application in for the iOS platform. In general, the application is well developed, however, it is still in its early stage. The thesis (written part), as a complementary results, is also with an average quality.

Evaluation criterion:

No evaluation scale.

8. Applicability of the results

Criteria description:

Indicate the potential of using the results of the thesis in practice.

Comments:

The student developed new mobile application and a corresponding REST API, however there is no clear novelty in the developed application.

Evaluation criterion:

No evaluation scale.

9. Questions for the defence

Criteria description:

Formulate any question(s) that the student should answer to the committee during the defence (use a bullet list).

Questions:

- Describe the main benefits of using the developed mobile application in comparison to the other existing and similar solutions.

Evaluation criterion:

The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).

10. The overall evaluation

60 (D)

Criteria description:

Summarize the parts of the thesis that had major impact on your evaluation. The overall evaluation **does not** have to be the arithmetic mean or any other formula with the values from the previous evaluation criteria 1 to 9.

Comments:

The student have shown skills in developing mobile application and application of the knowledge gained during the studies. The solution demands good knowledge in Web and mobile technologies. The student should have paid attention in the writing part and better motivate the thesis. However, mentioned shortcomings are not crucial for the final outcome of the thesis.

I recommend defense of the thesis with grade D.

Signature of the reviewer:

