

## OPPONENT'S REVIEW OF FINAL THESIS (experimental, creative, project)

Academic year:

Title of the thesis:	
Author of the thesis:	
Study programme:	
Supervisor of the thesis:	
Opponent of the thesis and his/her workplace:	

Evaluation criteria		Maximum points (100)	Assigned points
<b>Objectives of the work:</b> conciseness, topicality, follow-up on the topic of the final work and their fulfilment	<b>8 – 10 points</b> full achievement of objectives	<b>10</b>	
	<b>4 – 7 points</b> average achievement of objectives		
	<b>0 – 3 points</b> below-average achievement of objectives		
<b>Literature processing, topicality and adequacy of literary sources:</b> clarity and logical breakdown, relevance in relation to the topic and goal of the work, correctness and accuracy of citation and listing of bibliographic references according to the current standard (STN ISO 690), proportionality of the use of resources of domestic and foreign scientific literature, timeliness. High quality literary sources are considered to be scientific papers published most frequently in journals or works registered in WoS and Scopus databases	<b>16 – 20 points</b> at an excellent level – the condition for the above-mentioned number of points is that the author formally quoted in a correct, clear and precise manner all the used sources, out of which at least 30% represent relevant and high-quality domestic and foreign sources from the last 5 to 10 years (time definition depends on the topic of work)	<b>20</b>	
	<b>11 – 15 points</b> at a very good level – the condition for the above-mentioned number of points is that the author formally quoted in a correct, clear and precise manner all the used sources, out of which at least 30% represent adequate domestic and foreign sources from the last 5 or 10 years (time definition depends on the topic of work)		
	<b>6 – 10 points</b> at a good level – the author quoted used sources with minor formal errors, out of which less than 30% are of adequate domestic and foreign sources from the last 5 or 10 years (time definition depends on the topic of work)		
	<b>0 – 5 points</b> below-average level – author quoted insufficient number of literary sources and are of low-quality		
<b>Methodology and material:</b> suitability in relation to objectives, clarity, correctness of material descriptions, apparatus, experimental processing process, design, statistical methods so that the work is reproducible	<b>11 – 15 points</b> at an excellent level	<b>15</b>	
	<b>6 – 10 points</b> at an average level		
	<b>0 – 5 points</b> below-average level		

Evaluation criteria		Maximum points (100)	Assigned points
<b>Results and debate:</b> a sufficient number of results in relation to the achievement of the objectives of the work, level of statistical evaluation, interpretation of results, relevant comparison of results with similar works of other authors	<b>24 – 30 points</b> at an excellent level	<b>30</b>	
	<b>16 – 23 points</b> at a very good level		
	<b>8 – 15 points</b> at a good level		
	<b>0 – 7 points</b> below-average level		
<b>The conclusions of the work and their contribution:</b> formulation, clarity, relevance in relation to objectives, benefits for further development of knowledge and usability in practice	<b>11 – 15 points</b> at an excellent level	<b>15</b>	
	<b>6 – 10 points</b> at an average level		
	<b>0 – 5 points</b> below-average level		
<b>Formal processing of the final work:</b> compliance with the structure of work, assessment of the proportionality of individual parts of the work, language and technical processing of the text, correctness of professional terminology, appropriateness of the processing of numerical results into tables and graphs, level of processing of graphic outputs, overall level of final work in formal terms	<b>8 – 10 points</b> at an excellent level	<b>10</b>	
	<b>4 – 7 points</b> at an average level		
	<b>0 – 3 points</b> below-average level		
<b>Total points</b> (maximum number of points is 100)			
<b>Classification</b>			
The resulting classification: <b>A(1) excellent</b> (93 – 100 points), <b>B (1,5) very well</b> (86 – 92 points), <b>C (2) good</b> (79 – 85 points), <b>D (2,5) satisfactorily</b> (72 – 78 points), <b>E (3) sufficiently</b> (64 – 71 points), <b>FX (4) inadequately</b> (≤ 63 points)			
<b>Recommendation of the final defence of the thesis in front of the National Final Exam Commission</b>			
<b>Protocol on the control of originality</b> (percentage of the text having an overlap with the work index of the CRZP corpus)			
<b>Originality of the final work *</b>			

\* – if you would like to comment your view on the originality of the work in more detail and this field does not provide enough space, continue on page 4



**Substantive and formal comments on the work \***

**Questions on work (at least 3 questions)\***

\* – if you would like to comment your view on the work in more detail, or ask more questions and this field does not provide enough space, continue on page 4



**Additional substantive and formal comments on the work, originality of the work, or questions on the work**

.....  
**date**

.....  
**signature**