



**SUPERVISOR’S EVALUATION OF THE BACHELOR’S THESIS**

**Student:** Beibarys Abdigali

**Supervisor:** prof. Zuzana Komínková  
 Oplatková

Study program: **Software Engineering**  
 Study course/Specialization: --  
 Academic year: **2023/2024**

Bachelor’s Thesis topic: **Classification Methods Analysis for Benchmarking Datasets**

**Evaluation:**

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>
	Evaluation: A – Best; F - Unsatisfactory					
1. Fulfilment of all points of the assignment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Suitability of chosen resolution methods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Division of work (chapters, subchapters, paragraphs)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Working with literature and citations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Level of linguistic elaboration	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Formal level of work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Theoretical part elaboration quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Practical part elaboration quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Achieved results of the work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Contribution of the thesis and its exploitation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Cooperation of thesis author with the supervisor	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Result of the plagiarism test:**

The work was assessed in terms of plagiarism with the result 3% identity. Work is not plagiarism.

**Overall evaluation of the thesis:**

The resulting mark is not the average of all of the abovementioned evaluations. The mark is awarded by the thesis supervisor according to their deliberations and the ECTS classification scale:

A – Excellent, B – Very good, C – Good, D – Satisfactory, E – Sufficient, F – Insufficient.  
 Grade F also means “I do not recommend this thesis for defence.”

**I recommend this diploma thesis for its defence and suggest the following evaluation:**  
**D - Satisfactory.**  
 In the case of an “F – Insufficient” grade, provide comments and the shortages of the thesis and the reasons for this assessment.

The student came up with the topic together with the consultant of this work. I expected more focused analysis and review of current methods and used metrics. However, some issues did not fulfil my expectations (data set selections, analysis of metrics...). Except that, the level of English language should be improved for a better readability.

The work should look for the state-of-the-art techniques and evaluate them against standard and rare metrics to see the influence of the metrics. The student has selected some techniques which are

oftenly used. However, sometimes it seems that students do not understand the difference between classification and regression tasks. It is not clearly explained under which circumstances it is possible to cover diabetes data for regression in classification tasks. Therefore, one can have the feeling that the student does not distinguish properly between these tasks. Among this, I miss some overall comparison between standard and rare metrics performance within algorithms to see the influence of metrics better. I am surprised by values in Table 1 which seems that might not be computed correctly.

However, some work has been done and I recommend the thesis for the defence with the grade D-satisfactory.

Date: 24. 5. 2024

Thesis Supervisor's Signature: