CZECH UNIVERSITY OF LIFE SCIENCES PRAGUE

Faculty of Tropical AgriSciences

Evaluation of the Diploma Thesis by supervisor

Thesis Title	**Spatial and behavioural segregation between Agama agama and Agama weizholdi living in sympatry in Southern Senegal**
Name of the student	**Ing. Michal Semrád**
Thesis supervisor	**doc. Francisco Ceacero Herrador, Ph.D.**
Department	**Department of Animal Science and Food Processing**

	1	2	3	4
Cooperation and communication with the supervisor			■	
Schedule and timing of the research process			■	
Engagement of the student	■			
Choice of suitable methods		■		
Fulfilment of the aims		■		
Scientific contribution of the thesis				■
Theoretical background of the author			■	
Handling with data and information			■	
Handling with scientific literature (citations)				■
Argumentation and critical thinking			■	
Abstract and keywords		■		
Structure of the chapters and paragraphs	■			
Comprehensibility of the text				■
Accuracy of the terminology			■	
Quality of scientific language				■
Formatting, layout and general impression				■

Evaluation of the work by grade (1, 2, 3, 4)	**4**

Evaluation: 1 = the best

Date   13/06/2020

....

Supervisor signature

Other comments or suggestions:

Overall, I am not satisfied with the performance of the student. First, it should be indicated that the original research idea could not be carried out because of external factors, and a new topic had to be developed once already in the fieldwork. Once a new topic was set, the student conducted a reasonably good fieldwork. However, some parts of the fieldwork could have been improved, in my opinion due to inadequate preparation for the fieldwork (probably the supervisor is also partially responsible of this). Still, and considering all the mentioned problems, I´m somehow satisfied with the fieldwork and the data collected.

I am more disappointed with the following steps. The student never came for consultation. It also took long time to prepare the final databases, and once ready the student performed most of the analyses by himself, structured the chapters and wrote the thesis quite independently. Thus, guiding/supervising was hardly possible. Indeed, I saw the (almost ready) document just once, and the quality was poor in terms of structure, format and contents. I received a second version just one week before the deadline, with the negative surprise that most of my comments had not been applied. A third version was received the day of submission. This new version was much improved respect the previous ones, and I approved the submission. However, I feel that the work still needs much work. In terms of format and quality of presentation, there is still much to improve. The literature review is long for some irrelevant parts but scarce for more important ones. Many results are not well justified and the amount of sections and figures is unnecessarily long. The discussion is quite disconnected without a clear story, difficult to follow, and needing more references supporting many sentences.

Thus, I can´t recommend this thesis to pass. The student should work closer to the supervisor during the next months, follow the advice, improve the format, follow the guidelines carefully, include some pictures of the studied species and habitats, improve the maps, etc. and then improve the contents. I´m sure that the work may become an interesting master thesis, but not in the current version.

Plagiarism control: The system Theses.cz has assessed the thesis as original.

Date   13/06/2020

....
Supervisor signature