

SUPERVISOR'S EVALUATION OF THE MASTER'S THESIS

Student: AHMMED ADESANYA

Supervisor: Ing. Peter Janku, Ph.D.

Study program: **Information Technologies**

Study course/Specialization: **Software Engineering**

Academic year: **2023/2024**

Master's Thesis topic: **Efficiency Evaluation of Deploying Application**

Evaluation:

	A	B	C	D	E	F
Evaluation: A – Best; F - Unsatisfactory						
1. Fulfilment of all points of the assignment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Suitability of chosen resolution methods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Division of work (chapters, subchapters, paragraphs)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Working with literature and citations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Level of linguistic elaboration	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Formal level of work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Theoretical part elaboration quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Practical part elaboration quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Achieved results of the work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Contribution of the thesis and its exploitation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Cooperation of thesis author with the supervisor	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Result of the plagiarism test:

The work was assessed in terms of plagiarism with the result 4 % identity. Work is not 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:

D - Satisfactory.

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

The usage of cloud computing technologies, migration to the cloud infrastructure and cloud system development are often discussed. As a consequence, the comparison of cloud services and on-premise servers is a significant topic. Unfortunately, this thesis has a considerable number of imperfections that devalue the results.

The theoretical part of this thesis contains a sufficient introduction to all necessary topics and technologies which are used later in the practical part. Nevertheless, it is full of sentences directly copied from abstracts and other parts of papers. These sentences are marked by corresponding

sources but are not marked as direct citations. Moreover, the relation between the thesis topic and the copied sentence is sometimes fragile. The overall work with sources and citations can be considered as really weak.

Even if a part of the thesis is stated as "Methodology", only limited parts of the experiments are well described. For example, the number of measurements to be performed, the application's initial state, or the specific steps performed at each endpoint are not described anywhere.

There are also relatively big chapters of theoretical information in the practical section, sometimes stated repetitively. They are supposed to be placed in the theoretical part of this thesis. The discussions of results are mostly weak, with many general (sometimes subjective) statements. For example, the results of Latency and Response time measurements are the same, but this fact is fully omitted in the final discussions.

Some unreadable images only completed the overall thesis quality.

Despite the mentioned issues, it can be stated that the student fulfilled all assignment points. Therefore, I recommend this thesis for its defence and with a D - satisfactory grade.

Date: 27.5.2024

Thesis Supervisor's Signature: