

Review of Master's Thesis

Student: Branderský Gabriel, Bc.

Title: Library of Reusable Components and Utilities for the Angular 2 Framework (id 20183)

Reviewer: Beran Vítězslav, Ing., Ph.D., UPGM FIT VUT

- 1. Assignment complexity** **average assignment**
The author has focused on just one particular UI component. The resulting *table* component is, however, extensively processed and fully functional.
- 2. Completeness of assignment requirements** **acceptable under reservation**
The requirements 1. and 2. are presented briefly and generally (about 4 pages). As these are the key information to understand the importance and benefits of the work, this issue should be presented more widely.
- 3. Length of technical report** **in usual extent**
Some parts of the text are more of a manual-style (e.g. sec. 4.7). It would be better to focus on the key parts and principles of the solution instead of a complete list of options and parameters.
- 4. Presentation level of technical report** **65 p. (D)**
The technical report is written very clearly, but contains logical inconsistencies. The author, in the UX Design study part, describes the needs to study the user requirements and usage context, but then defines the use-case himself, without proper definition of the user and its requirements. It is not quite clear, if the user is a web-application developer or the web-application user. It is then quite difficult to assess if and how is the solution user-centred designed. The author talks about a solution suitable for data-intensive applications, but the text does not reveal what is meant by data-intensive, what problems it introduces and how it should be solved.
- 5. Formal aspects of technical report** **95 p. (A)**
The technical report has an excellent typographic level. The work is written in perfect English with only a couple of grammatical mistakes.
- 6. Literature usage** **75 p. (C)**
The author selects appropriate references and properly distinguishes his own work. The author unfortunately misuses the plural in the text. The work thus makes an impression, that it is the result of the team work, instead of the copywrite.
- 7. Implementation results** **95 p. (A)**
The work implements the *table* component with various interactive elements allowing the end-user to easily manipulate the table elements, sort and filter data, manage the columns and rows etc. The component is implemented in Angular 2 framework, that makes it very useful for web-application developers. Source-code is not very well documented, but the author follows the best programming standards so the code is understandable. The developed library for *table* component is complete and extensive; contains 89 files (131,8 kB) with the relevant source-code. The author utilises modern tools for end-to-end UI tests (e.g. Protector and Jasmine).
- 8. Utilizability of results**
The solution is well applicable. The author proves the actual need of his new component and its applicability by increasing download of his solution by the particular society.
- 9. Questions for defence**
 - Who is actually the user of your solution?
 - In sec. 4.5, the Design specifications is defined. Why you did not test, how your solution complies with this specification? How would you test it?
- 10. Total assessment** **85 p. very good (B)**
Mr. Brandersky has implemented a new UI *table* component into an Angular 2 framework. The solution is focused on both easy to use and good parameterisation of the developed component. The design properly reflects the characters of Angular 2 framework. The resulting solution has an excellent technical level and is widely applicable. The professional quality of work slightly reduces the way how the author defines the component user, the use-cases, utilisation of the UX design and final testing.

In Brno 7. June 2017

.....
signature

