SUA
Slovak University
of Agriculture
in Nitra

OPPONENT'S REVIEW OF FINAL THESIS
(experimental, creative, project)

Academic year:

Title of the thesis:	
Author of the thesis:	
Study programme:	
Supervisor of the thesis:	
Opponent of the thesis and his/her workplace:	

Evaluation criteria		Maximum points (100)	Assigned points
Objectives of the work: conciseness, topicality, follow-up on the topic of the final work and their fulfilment	**8 – 10 points** full achievement of objectives	10	
	4 – 7 points average achievement of objectives		
	0 – 3 points below-average achievement of objectives		
Literature processing, topicality and adequacy of literary sources: clarity and logical breakdown, relevance in relation to the topic and goal of the work, correctness and accuracy of citation and listing of bibliographic references according to the current standard (STN ISO 690), proportionality of the use of resources of domestic and foreign scientific literature, timeliness. High quality literary sources are considered to be scientific papers published most frequently in journals or works registered in WoS and Scopus databases	**16 – 20 points** at an excellent level – the condition for the above-mentioned number of points is that the author formally quoted in a correct, clear and precise manner all the used sources, out of which at least 30% represent relevant and high-quality domestic and foreign sources from the last 5 to 10 years (time definition depends on the topic of work)	20	
	11 – 15 points at a very good level – the condition for the above-mentioned number of points is that the author formally quoted in a correct, clear and precise manner all the used sources, out of which at least 30% represent adequate domestic and foreign sources from the last 5 or 10 years (time definition depends on the topic of work)		
	6 – 10 points at a good level – the author quoted used sources with minor formal errors, out of which less than 30% are of adequate domestic and foreign sources from the last 5 or 10 years (time definition depends on the topic of work)		
	0 – 5 points below-average level – author quoted insufficient number of literary sources and are of low-quality		
Methodology and material: suitability in relation to objectives, clarity, correctness of material descriptions, apparatus, experimental processing process, design, statistical methods so that the work is reproducible	**11 – 15 points** at an excellent level	15	
	6 – 10 points at an average level		
	0 – 5 points below-average level		

SUA
Slovak University
of Agriculture
in Nitra

page 2 / 3
www.uniag.sk/en

Evaluation criteria		Maximum points (100)	Assigned points
Results and debate: a sufficient number of results in relation to the achievement of the objectives of the work, level of statistical evaluation, interpretation of results, relevant comparison of results with similar works of other authors	**24 – 30 points** at an excellent level	30	
	16 – 23 points at a very good level		
	8 – 15 points at a good level		
	0 – 7 points below-average level		
The conclusions of the work and their contribution: formulation, clarity, relevance in relation to objectives, benefits for further development of knowledge and usability in practice	**11 – 15 points** at an excellent level	15	
	6 – 10 points at an average level		
	0 – 5 points below-average level		
Formal processing of the final work: compliance with the structure of work, assessment of the proportionality of individual parts of the work, language and technical processing of the text, correctness of professional terminology, appropriateness of the processing of numerical results into tables and graphs, level of processing of graphic outputs, overall level of final work in formal terms	**8 – 10 points** at an excellent level	10	
	4 – 7 points at an average level		
	0 – 3 points below-average level		
Total points (maximum number of points is 100)			
Classification			
The resulting classification: **A(1) excellent** (93 – 100 poitns), **B (1,5) very good** (86 – 92 poitns), **C (2) good** (79 – 85 poitns), **D (2,5) satisfactory** (72 – 78 poitns), **E (3) sufficient** (64 – 71 poitns), **FX (4) fail** (≤ 63 points)			
Recommendation of the final defence of the thesis in front of the National Final Exam Commission			
Protocol on the control of originality (percentage of the text having an overlap with the work index of the CRZP corpus)			
Originality of the final work			

SUA
Slovak University
of Agriculture
in Nitra

page 3 / 3
www.uniag.sk/en

Substantive and formal comments on the work

Questions on work (at least 3 questions)

....

date   **signature**