CZECH UNIVERSITY OF LIFE SCIENCES PRAGUE

Faculty of Economics and Management

Evaluation of the Bachelor Thesis by Opponent

Thesis Title	**Comparative analysis of best practices in cyber security for the prevention of Grey and Black hat hacking**
Name of the student	**Grace Zita Zavrel**
Thesis supervisor	**John Phillip Sabou, Ph.D.**
Department	**Department of Information Technologies**
Opponent	**Ing. Tomáš Vokoun**

Logical process being used	1 **2** 3 4
The structure of paragraphs and chapters	1 2 **3** 4
Formal presentation of the work, the overall impression	1 **2** 3 4
Formulation of objectives and Choice of appropriatemethods and methodology used	1 2 **3** 4
Work with data and information	1 2 **3** 4
Work with scientific literature (quotations, norms)	1 **2** 3 4
Clarity and professionalism of expression in the thesis	1 **2** 3 4
Summary and key-words comply with the content the thesis	**1** 2 3 4
Fulfillment of objectives, formulation of conclusions	1 2 **3** 4
Comprehensibility of the text and level of language	**1** 2 3 4
Evaluation of the work by grade (1, 2, 3, 4)	**2**

Evaluation: 1 = the best

Date 15/04/2023

el. signed by Ing. Tomáš Vokoun *on* 15/04/2023 20:55
Signature of Opponent

Other comments or suggestions:

The thesis under review is relevant to the student's study programme and the department's scope and meets all the formal requirements and structure expected by the faculty. However, the theoretical part (literature review) lacks a critical comparison of sources, and the thesis is structured with many sub-chapters that are only one-page long, and five levels of chapter numbering are used. Furthermore, the practical part consists of only three pages.

The student's own work mainly focuses on a survey and interviews, and the results and discussion section mostly presents a qualitative analysis of the survey and interviews (as expected in the methodology of the assignment), with a total of 121 respondents. However, it is not explained in the thesis how participants were selected or how the survey link was distributed. The same issue applies to the interviews, where it is not clear how individuals for the interviews were chosen or whether the group was representative. Although there is a detailed description of both the survey and interview process, the very beginning is missing. The student is aware of this issue, indirectly mentioning it in chapter 5.5.

The results and discussion section includes many charts, providing a two-dimensional overview of survey results, but almost no cross-question correlation analysis (due to a low number of participants, complete statistical analysis was impossible). Interviews provide mostly expected reactions, and without more knowledge of the background of respondents, the results are difficult to use. The author compares the results of the survey and interviews and obtains some usable results that can be seen as an answer to the objectives. However, the answer for the objective of determining the best practice for protection is not in the results or conclusion, where only a description of the current state or specialist's opinions are presented.

The work lacks a relation between the theoretical and practical parts, and expectations from the theoretical part are not validated, confirmed, or rejected in the practical part. Despite these major problems, the thesis is recommended for defence.

Questions for thesis defence:

Question 1: Based on your research, where do you perceive a distinction in cybersecurity management between enterprise and home environments?

Question 2: Are there any mandatory standards or procedures currently in place to guarantee a certain level of cybersecurity in enterprises, and were they considered when formulating your conclusions?

Date 15/04/2023

el. signed by Ing. Tomáš Vokoun *on* 15/04/2023 20:55

Signature of Opponent