

CZECH UNIVERSITY OF LIFE SCIENCES PRAGUE

Faculty of Economics and Management

Evaluation of the Bachelor Thesis by Opponent

Thesis Title **Comparison of Linux distributions**

Name of the student **Dube Motlatsi Ernest**

Thesis supervisor **doc. Ing. Arnošt Veselý, CSc.**

Department **Department of Information Engineering**

Opponent **Ing. Jan Tyrychtr, Ph.D.**

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

Evaluation: 1 = the best

Date 29/04/2020

.....
Signature of Opponent

Other comments or suggestions:

I understand that the author intended to describe the most used Linux distributions. I have many reservations on the foundations, the methodology, and several details of the bachelor thesis which I list in the sequel:

(i) Abstract/Summary – This is missing now.

(ii) The Objectives and methodology should state (a) the research question, (b) a clear summary of the steps/method/algorithm taken to address it. This is missing now.

(iii) Literature review – Once one has a clear understanding of the bachelor goal, author must prove that the state of the art and the state of practice are not enough to handle the problem. Theoretical background is very simplified and inaccurate.

(iv) Results – This chapter is not successful. Rather, it is a general description like a tutorial. Missing sophisticated analysis, which is common for comparison of software or systems.

(v) References are not according to ISO format.

In its current state, I think that the bachelor thesis proposes an interesting idea. Unfortunately, the whole proposal of bachelor thesis is very general, inaccurate and with a high degree of uncertainty.

Questions for thesis defence:

How can you measure criteria such as maintainability, continuity, stability, and security?

Operating systems are not perfect. That is why the manufactures provide support for their products. All the mentioned distributions are supported by very large communities or companies. Which distribution do you recommend for business companies?

Date 29/04/2020

.....
Signature of Opponent