CZECH UNIVERSITY OF LIFE SCIENCES PRAGUE

Faculty of Economics and Management

Evaluation of the Diploma Thesis by Opponent

Thesis Title	**Analysis of open source web content management systems**
Name of the student	**B.Sc. Taisir Obad**
Thesis supervisor	**Ing. Miloš Ulman, Ph.D.**
Department	**Department of Information Technologies**
Opponent	**Ing. Petr Cihelka**

	1	2	3	4
Thesis topic and thesis significance (relevance)		■		
Formulation of objectives	■			
Choice of appropriate methods and methodology used		■		
Work with data and information		■		
Evidence of a logical process being used		■		
Theoretical background of an author		■		
The structure of paragraphs and chapters			■	
Work with scientific literature (quotations, norms)		■		
Comprehensibility of the text and level of language			■	
Clarity and professionalism of expression in the thesis			■	
Formal presentation of the work, the overall impression			■	
Fulfillment of objectives		■		
Formulation of conclusions		■		
Professional contribution of the work and its practical usage			■	
Summary and key-words comply with the content of thesis		■		

Evaluation of the work by grade (1, 2, 3, 4)   **2**

Evaluation: 1 = the best

Date   05/16/2017

....

Signature of Opponent

Other comments or suggestions:

The diploma thesis is well researched and prepared. It contains a couple of misspellings and inaccuracies which do not have a major impact on the content or the goal of the thesis itself, and can thus be tolerated. However, I have to bring up a couple of points:

- Inconsistent use of commonly known abbreviations and product names, such as JavaScript vs java script.

- Unclear introduction of some terms, eg. URI.

In Chapter 3, the author describes communication between web browser and web server. The description of the communication, I quote "Clients use browser application to send URIs via HTTP to servers requesting a Web page" is quite shallow, especially from the computer science student. Also, in this paragraph, the author uses Netscape Navigator as an example which was discontinued in year 1998.

Furthermore, another inconsistent use of abbreviations can be found in Chapter 3.1, where author uses URI as indication of the internet address. But in Chapter 3.3, the author introduces another term, URL.

In Chapter 3.6, the author uses a wrong term "program" for technologies such as HTML, CSS and JavaScript. Those should be referred to as languages.

The practical part of the thesis in which the author compares individual CMS cannot be criticized. The analysis is tackled very well.

I appreciated the preparation of wireframe models for the layout of internet presentation. The responsiveness of the presentation is also valued.

It is hard to find anything stellar about the coding example. The part is very brief and should warrant higher attention. The author describes the whole process of the webpage creation in only 3 pages, including examples.

The demonstrated email, password, and username validation is blatantly incorrect and password validation has gone AWOL.

However, all things considered it can still be concluded that the partial requirements presented by this thesis for the degree of master have been successfully met.

Questions for thesis defence:

1) Define and describe Software architecture patterns.

2) Describe the difference between synchronous and asynchronous communication. Describe the process of AJAX communication between client side and server side.

Date   05/16/2017

....
Signature of Opponent