

# Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

Czech Technical University in Prague

Faculty of Information Technology

**Student:** Pavel Goncharov  
**Supervisor:** Ing. Alexandru Moucha, Ph.D.  
**Thesis title:** Analysis of Trust Methods in Ad-hoc and Sensor Networks  
**Branch of the study:** Information Technology (Bachelor)

Date: 8. 6. 2015

<p><i>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p><b>1. Difficulty and other comments on the assignment</b></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 requirements and the way this Bachelor Thesis (further BT) was realised is more close to a Diploma Thesis (further DT). The implementation has to be correct, well documented, easily traceable and expandable because it forms the basis for further research into the problematic of trust in ad-hoc networks.</p>	<p><i>The evaluation scale: 1 to 5.</i></p> <p><b>1 = extremely challenging assignment,</b>  <b>2 = rather difficult assignment,</b>  <b>3 = assignment of average difficulty,</b>  <b>4 = easier, but still sufficient assignment,</b>  <b>5 = insufficient assignment</b></p>
<p><i>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p><b>2. Fulfilment of the assignment</b></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 student worked very hard to deliver a high quality work.</p>	<p><i>The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.</i></p> <p><b>1 = assignment fulfilled,</b>  <b>2 = assignment fulfilled with minor objections,</b>  <b>3 = assignment fulfilled with major objections,</b>  <b>4 = assignment not fulfilled</b></p>
<p><i>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p><b>3. Size of the main written part</b></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 size of the BT is actually the one recommended for a DT.</p>	<p><i>The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.</i></p> <p><b>1 = meets the criteria,</b>  <b>2 = meets the criteria with minor objections,</b>  <b>3 = meets the criteria with major objections,</b>  <b>4 = does not meet the criteria</b></p>
<p><i>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p><b>4. Factual and logical level of the thesis</b></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 student was very motivated, he had to take decisions to fulfil the required level of quality.</p>	<p><i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i></p> <p><b>97 (A)</b></p>
<p><i>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p><b>5. Formal level of the thesis</b></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> Excellent quality for the delivered materials and simulator.</p>	<p><i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i></p> <p><b>97 (A)</b></p>
<p><i>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p><b>6. Bibliography</b></p> <p><i>Criteria description:</i> 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.</p>	<p><i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i></p> <p><b>97 (A)</b></p>

*Comments:*

Excellent work with different sources of literature for both the theoretical part (the scientific one) and the implementation part (language, libraries, etc).

*Evaluation criterion:*

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

**7. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards**

97 (A)

*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 results as they are now are not publishable (the outcomes are a simulator for trust and the documentation). However the simulator can and will be used for further research in the area of ad-hoc and sensor networks and those results are publishable.

*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:*

Already explained at 7.

*Evaluation criterion:*

*The evaluation scale: 1 to 5.*

**9. Activity and self-reliance of the student**

9a:

**1 = excellent activity,**

**2 = very good activity,**

**3 = average activity,**

**4 = weaker, but still sufficient activity,**

**5 = insufficient activity**

9b:

**1 = excellent self-reliance,**

**2 = very good self-reliance,**

**3 = average self-reliance,**

**4 = weaker, but still sufficient self-reliance,**

**5 = insufficient self-reliance.**

*Criteria description:*

Review student's activity while working on this final thesis, student's punctuality when meeting the deadlines and consulting continuously and also, student's preparedness for these consultations. Furthermore, review student's independency.

*Comments:*

Excellent cooperation with the student.

*Evaluation criterion:*

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

**10. The overall evaluation**

97 (A)

*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 work is better than some DT that I have seen in my career. The student deserves a high grading for his activity.

Signature of the supervisor: