Review of Bachelor's Thesis

Student: Hubík Antonín
Title: Mobile Game for Practicing English Vocabulary (id 25035)
Reviewer: Kanich Ondřej, Ing., Ph.D., DITS FIT BUT

1. Assignment complexity   **average assignment**

I consider the difficulty of this work's assignment to be average. The goal of this work is to develop a two player online mobile game inspired by the game "Word chain".

2. Completeness of assignment requirements   **student reasonably departed from the assignment with serious reservations**

There are two main issues with fulfilling the assignment. The first one is that the game was never tested on other platforms than Android. Theoretically, the game was developed with this requirement in mind, so it should work (with some minor platform specific settings) but it was not tested. Local testing would require an Apple device which the student does not own. The second and a little bit more serious issue is that the game was not deployed online, partially because of licencing issues (which also prevented online testing on the other platforms). Local testing of the two player game failed as well (performance issues of the simulator and student's hardware). On the other hand the student implemented user authentication, gamification components and a possibility to expand the in-game dictionary (a centralized method for proposal and approval of words). All these parts are extending the assignment.

3. Length of technical report   **in usual extent**

The length of the thesis is in the usual range.

4. Presentation level of technical report   **58 p. (E)**

The logical structure and continuity of each chapter is fine. The work has a clear flow and is easily readable. The problem is that there are a lot of chapters. The whole text (primarily the practical part) is very fragmented, there are overall 9 chapters and on several occasions there is usage of 4th level headlines. The reason is partially hidden in student's ambition to make a lot of extensions which resulted in description of various topics. The practical part takes almost two thirds of the work.

5. Formal aspects of technical report   **71 p. (C)**

Except three major mistakes there are only minor issues with formal aspects of the report. The major ones are: the wrong year and department on the title page and the absence of the extended abstract. Minor issues are that sometimes references lack the specifications, some figures are not positioned optimally and there are a few typos. From the grammatical point of view the text is almost perfect.

6. Literature usage   **78 p. (C)**

The bibliography contains relevant and current sources. These are used in the work correctly and thanks to this it is possible to distinguish the student's own work from the taken passages. However, in some parts of the description of the current state of the art, I would recommend the more extensive use of citations. Bibliographic data are complete and in accordance with citation practices.

7. Implementation results   **83 p. (B)**

I will not comment the parts which are not in compliance with the assignment (that was discussed in previous points). There are not many comments in the code, but the API has its own web documentation. According to the student, the application was internally tested with several users and their feedback is discussed in the work and some changes were also changed in the application. Overall the game (presented as pass and play) is very nice, all the statistics, points, user profiles looks very promising. In live demonstration everything worked correctly.

8. Utilizability of results

From the academic perspective there are no usable results. Nevertheless finalizing and deploying the application online could bring the educational value to the public.

9. Questions for defence

- Can you describe the process of validation of word given by user in-game? How are the dictionaries checked and how is it possible to add new words?
- Would it be possible for the game to balance users with different levels of English?

10. Total assessment   **48 p. failed (F)**

Evaluation of this thesis is fairly difficult. Student did substantial amount of work on his mobile application. The problem is that the work was on functionalities which were not specified in the assignment. Two parts of the

assignment were not tested/fulfilled, there were some reasons behind that but I still think that there could have been done more. The text part of the work would be also acceptable without these wrong/missing mandatory parts. To sum it up I think that student should get a little bit more time to test missing parts from the assignment and than defend his otherwise good work. Because of that I propose an overall evaluation of the grade **F** (**48** points).

In Brno 3 June 2022

Kanich Ondřej, Ing., Ph.D.
reviewer