OPPONENT´S REVIEW OF BACHELOR'S THESIS

Name of student: Danylko Denys

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

Reviewer : Ing. Tomáš Nacházel, Ph.D.

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	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Setting and meeting objectives	☐	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐
Treating theoretical aspects of the topic	☐	☐	☐	☒	☒	☐
Treating practical aspects of the topic	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Adequacy of applied methods and their use	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Depth and accuracy of implemented analysis	☐	☐	☐	☒	☒	☐
Dealing with literature sources	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☒
Logical structure and composition of the thesis	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Language and terminology	☐	☐	☐	☒	☒	☐
Formal layout	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Student´s contribution	☐	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐
Practical applicability of results	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments to results of anti-plagiarism check:
Anti-plagiarism check result shows a score of 4%. Unfortunately, marked parts of texts are copied without proper mention of the original source. It is short introduction paragraph of chapter 4.1 and the following list of benefits in the same chapter. The original source is among references (IThemes [1]), but its numbered reference is missing directly in text. Out of 12 sources only 6 of them have references in the text of this thesis.

The copied sentences really stand out in the text due to the otherwise poor level of English. Since all sources are listed in the references, I consider this issue rather as mismanagement of citations than plagiarism.

Comments and recommendations:
Abbreviations should be explained when used for the first time in the main text of the thesis (even if it was explained in the abstract): CMS, B2B, SEO just in the first three chapters. At least the list of abbreviations at the beginning of the thesis would be helpful.

The level of English is poor but mostly sufficient to understand. Throughout the thesis, there are odd phrases, spelling errors, and poorly structured sentences. For example, 2nd paragraph of chapter 1;

was/were, "hi", extra space before a comma in chapter 3; chapter 4.1 "…platrforms exisitng, as it mentioned on the picture below." (the figure is above); and so on.

One of the benefits of WordPress is "Easy to use" and one of the disadvantages is "Not easy to use" (Chapter 4.1). I probably understand what the author wanted to say, but there are better ways to describe it.

There is no page numbering at all which makes the Table of Contents almost useless. Also, some sub-chapters in chapter 5 are not included in the numbered structure.

Similar to the issue described in comments to the anti-plagiarism check. Chapter 5 has a lot of text copied from another source. This time, it is referenced in the text, but it is not marked as an exact citation. The copied text includes motivational informal sentences belonging rather to an advertisement than a thesis. The structure of chapter 5 is also mostly taken from article [8] – but the copied part stops right before the original page went through some disadvantages of the describer architecture. Together with advertisement-like text, it seems that this chapter is not objective at all.

The table in chapter 7 is missing a title and number and contains conflicting evaluations. The first row says that the performance of JAMStack is "Superior" while stating that the performance of Traditional Content Management Systems (CMS) is "Better than JAMStack". The table could also mention at least some stronger features of Traditional CMS (presented in chapter 4) so the table is more balanced and not one-sided towards JAMStack.

Overall assessment and reasons for the final grade:
In this thesis, the author compared web development solutions and documented the decision-making behind his transition from traditional CMS to JAMStack architecture.

The thesis is well structured, although the results of the questionnaire in the Appendix could have been included or at least mentioned in the main text.

In the theoretical part of the thesis (chapters 4 and 5), the author describes a traditional approach and compares it to a newer more dynamic one. A significant part of these chapters is copied from sources that are mostly cited (except one – see comments to result of anti-plagiarism check). The author used just enough recent and valid sources.

In the practical part of the thesis (chapters 6 and 7), the author explains the architecture of JAMStack with his project and compares it to traditional CMS.

The topic and objective of the thesis correspond with the study field of Information Management. I recommend the thesis for oral defence.

Questions for oral defence:
1) Throughout the thesis, great performance is advertised as a benefit of JAMStack over other solutions; for example in the appendix: "…this platform[WordPress] is slow (compared with JAM Stack technology)", but in chapter 7 there is clearly stated that Traditional CMS perform better: "From the side of perfomance Traditional CMS is better than JAMStack". Can you explain these statements?
2) Have you already decided in favor of JAMStack when you started working on this thesis?

I recommend the thesis for oral defence.

Suggested final grade: D

Hradec Králové, 19/05/2022

_____
signature