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| **Elaboration of the topic, quality of the performed engineering work**  The elaboration of the work is excellent: 40-45  The elaboration of the work is slightly incomplete: 30-40  The elaboration of the work is medium: 5-35  Routine work, with novel approach: 25-45  Routine work, with routine approach: 15-35  Routine work, incompetent approach: 5-25 | 0 | 45 |  |
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| **Structure of the thesis**  well-written, logically built-up and understandable: 15  some smaller logical mistakes in the structure: 8-12  significant mistakes in the structure: 4-10  badly written: max. 5 | 0 | 15 |  |
| **Representation of the thesis**  the thesis is stylish, the language is excellent: 10  smaller mistakes in the style and language are present: 7-9  the thesis has medium style and significant mistakes in the language: 3-6  insufficient level in style and language: 0-3 | 0 | 10 |  |
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***Review:***

The review may cover the following points (optional)

1. Identification of the reviewed work with the author's name, student ID and the title of the dissertation.
2. Summary in a few sentences about the elaboration. Quantitative evaluation of the dissertation (scope, appendix, literature review, etc.).
3. **Exhaustive evaluation: Did the candidate answer the questions written in the task, did he / she complete the required tasks? What questions did he / she not answer or what tasks did he / she not solve (not at all or not satisfactorily), or what tasks, if not originally prescribed, did he / she solve?** The tasks that were mentioned were:

* implemented completely, and even interpreted in a special way;
* implemented completely;
* implemented in a smaller scale (it must be mentioned why he / she could not achieve the goals);
* implemented with significant deficiency (it must be mentioned why he / she could not achieve the goals);
* not implemented at all (it must be mentioned why he / she could not achieve the goals).

1. **Technical check** – Evaluation of the structure of the thesis:
   * Evaluation of the structure: is it logically sound, understandable, etc.
   * Are the calculation, design, analysis, testing, etc. methods correct? Have they been  
     applied correctly? Are the considerations and conclusions correctly drawn?
   * Complete list about the mistakes, typos and their level.
2. **Individual evaluation** – Self-evaluation (by the candidate) of the obtained:
   * Are the results acceptable;
   * Do they have any novelty;
   * Can they be directly or indirectly applied;
   * Has any evaluation been carried out about the possible impact of the results?
3. Brief summary about the candidate's abilities, independence, judgment, etc. which has been testified in the submitted thesis. Questions asked by the reviewer (which the candidate must answer on the defense).
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