

CZECH UNIVERSITY OF LIFE SCIENCES PRAGUE

Faculty of Tropical AgriSciences

Evaluation of the Diploma Thesis by Opponent

Thesis Title **The Survey of Zoonotic Aspects of Some Parasitic Diseases in the Czech Republic**

Name of the student **B.Sc. Shavkat Azimov**

Thesis supervisor **prof. MVDr. Daniela Lukešová, CSc.**

Department **Department of Animal Science and Food Processing**

Opponent **doc. MVDr. Alica Kočíšová, PhD.**

Formulation of the aims	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Choice of suitable methods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fulfilment of the aims	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scientific contribution of the thesis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Originality of the thesis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Theoretical background of the author	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Handling with data and information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Handling with scientific literature (citations)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Argumentation and critical thinking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Abstract and keywords	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Structure of the chapters and paragraphs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comprehensibility of the text	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accuracy of the terminology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Quality of scientific language	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Formatting, layout and general impression	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation of the work by grade (1, 2, 3, 4)				4

Evaluation: 1 = the best

Date 05/23/2017

Signature of Opponent

Other comments or suggestions:

The diploma thesis has a very recent topics, it is written in 66 pages and divided into the usual chapters, supplemented by 7 attachments. Individual chapters are logical. Literature Review – By Manual Control and Warning of Tamara Fedorova however, this part is compiled from parts of texts published by other authors, the correct citation standard was not followed. The pictures in this part of the work are poor, blurred (e.g. Figures 2, 3, 6, 7 etc.), Fig. 4 and 5 the student is mentioned as their author, but this is not true, the student only partially modified the images created by other authors.

The aim of the thesis is to formulate and monitoring of cysticercosis/taeniosis and alveolar echinococcosis in the Czech Republic and the EU countries in 2010-2016.

However, the diploma thesis should be experimental in at least a small part, but in the present work the student processed the results obtained from the State Health Institute or the State Veterinary Administration, i.e. Evaluated data from available databases. From the "Methodology" section, it is not clear how many samples he examined himself and in what time period, or if only once time visited the slaughterhouse where he examined a couple of samples. I do not want to believe that he would himself examine the samples listed in Table No. 3 (page 22). The student is in the text on p. 25 refers to Table No. 4, but there is no such table at work!

Part of the results is processed based on the results from the above mentioned databases, but it is not an experiment. Picture no. 11 (p. 30) does not make sense, it should, by title, express the prevalence of taeniosis in the Czech Republic, but there is only a dark field. Figures No. 12, 13, 14 and 15 are accurately made, but insufficiently explained in the text.

The discussion is logically written, the question remains whether the student has drawn it up or preceded as in the chapter "literature review", i.e. he copied individual paragraphs of other authors? Unfortunately, as an opponent, I do not have the opportunity or the time to do such control.

In the literature, the student presents 73 literary sources, but during the control I found that at least 14 sources referred to in the text do not cited (this probably occurred when he copied text articles). I also draw attention to the fact that authors have to be referring in alphabetical order.

There are a number of technical errors in the work.

As far as the annexes are concerned, I do not consider it necessary to add them to the diploma thesis; besides, the tables in these annexes (II, III, IV and V) are poor, blurry, and difficult to read.

Based on the above, I recommend that the thesis have to be redrafted and not yet admitted to the defence.

Questions for thesis defence:

Based on the above, I recommend that the thesis have to be redrafted and not yet admitted to the defence and I do not have questions.

Date 05/23/2017

.....
Signature of Opponent