

SUPERVISOR'S REVIEW OF BACHELOR'S THESIS

Name of student: Denys Danylko

Thesis title: Alternatives to the content management system for a consulting firm

Reviewer : Daniela Ponce

Thesis objective: To compare and evaluate JAMStack architecture and architecture solution of traditional Content Management System

Criteria required for evaluation	Evaluation scale (grade)					
	A	B	C	D	E	F
Content relevant to the field of study	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Setting and meeting objectives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Treating theoretical aspects of the topic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Treating practical aspects of the topic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Adequacy of applied methods and their use	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Depth and accuracy of implemented analysis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dealing with literature sources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Logical structure and composition of the thesis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Language and terminology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Formal layout	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student's contribution	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practical applicability of results	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments to results of anti-plagiarism check:

The result of the anti-plagiarism check is a match of 4 %. The match is due to the verbatim adoption of a multi-paragraph description of one of the technologies used from the technology tutorial. The retrieved text is used without a reference to its source. At least, the source of the retrieved text is listed in the References section.

Comments and recommendations:

Page numbering is missing.

On the page 22, the last sentence is cut in the middle: "And in package.json"

No source is given for the images.

Overall assessment and reasons for the final grade:

The aim of this work is to compare and evaluate JAMStack architecture and architecture solution of traditional Content Management System. The aim of the thesis was chosen appropriately, however the comparison and evaluation of the architectures is short, concise and relatively simple.

The appropriateness of the method used for comparison and evaluation is not justified, the individual criteria do not have set weights (nor are they considered), and there is no elaborate way of combining the partial results into a single conclusion. The criteria are evaluated on the basis of information from a few sources and also using the personal experience of the author, but the reader has not been given the opportunity to share or verify his experience.

The theoretical section is brief to shallow, sometimes giving the impression of a review or marketing material instead of a technical explanation.

The practical part is only hinted at, the reader only learns the structure of the project. The microservices mentioned in the JAMstack diagram are not introduced in any way at the design or implementation stage, and no code samples are given in the work. Based on the practical part, the reader gets a very weak idea of what to expect from the transition to JAMstack, how to proceed, what to do in each step.

The literature work is sufficient, the author refers to the literature used at the point of use, but not in every case. There is no reference to the source for the figures. The list of literature used is modest, with some items repeated.

The logical structure of the thesis is good, the parts flow smoothly into each other.

The thesis has the parts and elements required by the Methodological Guidelines. On the first page, a few words in Czech were left in.

Questions for oral defence:

Give an example of microservices for the practical part of the bachelor thesis.

I recommend the thesis for oral defence.

Suggested final grade: D

Hradec Králové, 20/05/2022

signature