

## THESIS SUPERVISOR'S REVIEW OF THE DIPLOMA THESIS

**Student:** Denis Varaksin

**Thesis  
Supervisor:**

**Ing. Dušan Hrabec, Ph.D.**

Study program: **Engineering Informatics**  
Study discipline: **Integrated Systems in Buildings**  
Academic year: **2018/2019**

Diploma Thesis Topic: **Traffic Data Prediction**

**Evaluation:**

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>
	Evaluation: A – Best; F - Unsatisfactory					
1. Difficulty of the assigned task(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Fulfilment of all points of the assignment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Working with literature and citations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Level of linguistic elaboration	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Formal elaboration – overall impression	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Logical structuring of the thesis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Suitability of chosen resolution methods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Theoretical part elaboration quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Practical part elaboration quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Results and their presentation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Thesis conclusions and their formulation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Contribution of the thesis and its exploitation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Cooperation of thesis author with the supervisor	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Result of the plagiarism test:**

The thesis was not found as a plagiarism.

**Overall evaluation of the thesis:**

The resulting mark is not the average of all of the abovementioned evaluations. The mark is awarded by the thesis supervisor according to their deliberations and the ECTS classification scale:

A – Excellent, B – Very good, C – Good, D – Satisfactory, E – Sufficient, F – Insufficient.

Grade F also means “I do not recommend this thesis for defence.”

**I recommend this diploma thesis for its defence and suggest the following evaluation:**

**E - Sufficient.**

In the case of an “F – Insufficient” grade, provide comments and the shortages of the thesis and the reasons for this assessment.

The master thesis topic was formulated as part of cooperation between the FAI TBU and CROSS, a.s. The company provided illustrative data that should be analyzed and (statistically) processed and some suggestions and conclusions should be made as a result of the thesis. Student complied with the

most of the assigned parts of work, however, some of the thesis guidelines should be better elaborated (e.g., points 5, 6 and partially 7).

My main objections relate to the student's communication that was very rare. As a result, the student has worked under a time pressure during last months and, at the end, the thesis results were not properly discussed with the company that was one of the main assigned tasks. On the other hand, this shows that the student is able to work independently on various assigned difficult projects. The other important objection is regarding totally bad work with citations as there are no citations in the text at all and so no reference from the list of references was cited (then, it is quite unclear which parts are adapted and which are original).

Based on my particular grades and comments I recommend the thesis for the defence and suggest evaluation E. However, the student should answer and defend the following questions and issues based on the stated thesis guidelines:

1. Is there any feedback from the company regarding the developed solution and obtained results (point 5)?
2. The thesis does not provide any clear discussion with regards to the so-called smart city projects (point 6). Please discuss.
3. Clearly discuss the main findings of the work (point 7).

Date: 24. 5. 2019

Thesis Supervisor's Signature: