

Thesis Reviewer's Report

Student: Sharmine Tatenda Jazi
 Title: Usability and Accessibility Considerations as an Approach of Geoportals Improvement
 Supervisor: prof. Ing. Jitka Komárková, Ph.D.
 Reviewer: doc. Ing. Miloslav Hub, Ph.D.
 Reviewer's job title: University of Pardubice, associate professor

Assessment criteria

	excellent	very good	acceptable	unacceptable	N/A
Achievement of the aims of the thesis	<input type="checkbox"/>	×	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use of appropriate methods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	×	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Depth of analysis (in relation to the topic)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	×	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Structure and extent of the thesis	<input type="checkbox"/>	×	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use of Czech and foreign sources (including references)	<input type="checkbox"/>	×	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Formal aspects (text, diagrams, charts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	×	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Quality of language (style, grammar, terminology)	<input type="checkbox"/>	×	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Usability of the results

	high	medium	low	N/A
In theory	<input type="checkbox"/>	×	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
In practice	×	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other comments

The text is written in an understandable form, the individual chapters follow each other logically. Formal deficiencies appear in the work (for example, the caption of Figure 1, Error on page 23, etc.). The author does not always use the passive voice. In terms of content, I consider the work rather average. I believe that some parts of the work should have been more justified. For example, it is not clear how the weights of the uniform heuristic criteria were set and the like.

Questions and suggestions for the defence


1. Explain how you specifically determined the weight (importance) of the individual heuristic criteria.
2. How did you come to the conclusions shown on pages 41 to 48?

Overall evaluation

I recommend the thesis for defence.

The proposed grade for the thesis: C

In Pardubice on 23.5.2024

Signature..........