

THESIS REVIEWER'S OPINION						
Student's full name	Quynh Hoa Tran					
Thesis title	Mumio: natural pharmaceutical material					
Reviewer's name	prof. Ing. Petr Svoboda, Ph.D.					
Degree course	B2808 Chemistry and technology of materials					
Mode of study	Polymer materials and technology					
Thesis evaluation criteria	Classification grade according to ECTS					
Structure						
Outline and division			B			
Language level				C		
Formatting (citations, presentation)					D	
Content						
Thesis statement formulation				C		
Sources and their utilization				C		
Methods of processing the research problem						E
Level of analytical and interpretive components						E
Formulation of conclusions and meeting the objectives					D	
Originality and vocational contribution			B			
<p>Evaluation justification (strengths and weaknesses of thesis): This thesis is written on 60 pages, theoretical part is on 26 pages and experimental part is on 34 pages. References part contains 32 literature sources arranged in a very strange way. One literature source has several numbers. I have never seen such arrangement. This is definitely wrong. Theoretical part deals with pharmaceutical and natural materials and then focuses on mumio. English is rather poor. For example on page 11 is sentence: "Was also significantly increased the level of vitamin E and C." page 46: "Offers of pharmaceutical products is today much." Since the student studies speciality "Polymer materials and technology" it is very strange on page 13 to explain under line what polymer is. Page 38: viscosity in MPa. Wrong unit. Page 42: Polyvinyl alcohol. The chemical structure should be shown in a better way. Page 46: Conclusion looks more like an advertisement for mumio product and not as a conclusion of research work suitable for bachelor thesis.</p>						

Questions to be answered by student:

- 1) page 36: "mumio powder was dissolved in water". Is it soluble in pure water? Shouldn't you rather use "dispersed"?
- 2) page 40, Table 5. What the numbers exactly mean? Please explain in detail.

The work was checked by the plagiarism detection system Theses with the result of negative/positive.*

Was not checked. This is responsibility of the supervisor.

Overall mark**

			D		
--	--	--	---	--	--

Date: 6.6.2014

Signature:

* Circle the appropriate determination.

** Overall mark is not a mathematical average of individual marks.