

CZECH UNIVERSITY OF LIFE SCIENCES PRAGUE

Faculty of Environmental Sciences

Evaluation of the Bachelor Thesis by Opponent

Thesis Title **Case study – constructed wetland Spálené Poříčí**

Name of the student **Michaela Porazíková**

Thesis supervisor **Ing. Tereza Hnátková, Ph.D.**

Department **Department of Applied Ecology**

Opponent **Hannu Poutiainen**

Formulation of objectives	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Work with data and information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Overall approach and work with data and information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
The structure of paragraphs and chapters	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Work with scientific literature (quotations, norms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Skill level of language used	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Clarity and professionalism of expression in the work	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Formal presentation of the work, the overall impression	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Fulfillment of objectives, formulation of conclusions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Summary and key-words comply with the content of 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)				1

Evaluation: 1 = the best

Date 29/04/2021

.....
Signature of Opponent

Other comments or suggestions:

On the whole thesis is good. Language and especially scientific part are worthy of merit. Study of purification efficiency over longer time period is very interesting. It was however unclear if forecasts for future were included in analysis. Avg COD at site is 1/5th of Finnish values maybe combined sewerage is used. Good comparison of CW vs WWTP process with adv/disadvantages. Methodology description is somewhat weak, CW process description on the other hand excellent. Results are presented in a clear manner and explanations are provided. In Fig 11-20 I would've marked: original data from.... below Figs. Table 15 is very good own work. Final analysis of results is excellent with process improvement suggestions, but little long (results are restated).

Questions for thesis defence:

Was forecasts for further improvements or extensions included in the thesis work?



Date 29/04/2021

.....
Signature of Opponent