

CZECH UNIVERSITY OF LIFE SCIENCES PRAGUE

Faculty of Tropical AgriSciences

Evaluation of the Diploma Thesis by Opponent

Thesis Title **Reproductive Behaviour of Eland (*Taurotragus oryx*)**

Name of the student **Bc. Alexandra Tamchynová**

Thesis supervisor **Ing. Radim Kotrba, Ph.D.**

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

Opponent **Ing. Radka Šárová, Ph.D.**

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

Evaluation: 1 = the best

Date 06/02/2017

.....
Signature of Opponent

Other comments or suggestions:

The thesis Reproductive behaviour of eland (*Taurotragus oryx*) focuses on the length of copulation, the time between consecutive copulation and the length of gestation.

There are several crucial comments to this thesis:

The abstract of the thesis and keywords are missing. The chapter Introduction is very vague and the chapter Literature review corresponds only partly with the chapter Aims and hypotheses. Based on the literature review it is not clear why the particular hypotheses were suggested. Therefore I recommend adding some studies on how woo behaviour and other factors can influence the length of copulation and time between consecutive copulation and which factors can influence the length of gestation. It is not clear why most of the hypotheses consider both male and female behaviour (1a, 1b, 3a) and hypotheses 3b and 3c are separated.

In the methods, the exact duration of observation, the information whether it was the whole mating season and number of females in each group is necessary. The male should be also considered as a repeated variable as 1 male was measured twice. The list of observed behaviour which was considered as woo behaviour with observed frequencies and/or graphs presenting the results would be helpful for better understanding. The graphs 3, 4, 5 and 6 mostly show the distribution of normality but not the results. The Discussion is not well developed and I recommend discussing the results with more literature. Moreover, the 'time between copulation' is not discussed at all. The second sentence in the Conclusion does not belong to the conclusion. Usually, numeration of figures is done based on the order of the figures (here not) and some of the figures (Fig. 2, 4, 5, 6) are not cited in the text.

In my opinion, I strongly recommend improving the thesis before submission for defense.

Questions for thesis defence:

1. Which factors influence the length of copulation and time between copulation?
2. Which factors influence the length of gestation?
3. Why did you use 4 different normality tests?

Date 06/02/2017

.....
Signature of Opponent