



University of South Bohemia in České Budějovice  
Faculty of Fisheries and Protection of Waters  
Zátiší 728/II  
389 25 Vodňany

## Supervisor's review of bachelor thesis

Student:

Field of study:

Form of study:

Title of the final thesis:

Supervisor of the final thesis:

Name, surname, titles:

### 1. Formulation of the thesis's objectives

An introduction to the solution of problems is evaluated, i.e. the justification of the need for the solution of the thesis and the understandability and logicity of the stated objectives with respect to the thesis topic:

Evaluation (mark from 1 – the best to 4 – insufficient):  1  2  3  4

Comment on the evaluation (justification of the proposed mark). Comment is compulsory.

The current state of fish sperm cryopreservation in relation to fish taxonomic diversity is correctly described in Introduction part of the thesis. This description allows to understand the main objectives of the thesis. The goal is clearly explained.

## 2. Method of the thesis's solution

The material and methodology used to solve the objectives of the thesis including the way of statistical analysis of data (suitability, comprehensibility, relevance, complexity) are evaluated. In case of the review-type thesis the content structure, the logicity of thesis segmenting, the concept of the review thesis are evaluated. Adherence to the instructions of the supervisor, keeping the research plan and other information given on the assignment form, the degree of self-involvement in the solution of the thesis, the autonomy, creativity, etc. are also evaluated.

**Evaluation** (mark from 1 – the best to 4 – insufficient):  1  2  3  4

**Comment on the evaluation** (justification of the proposed mark). Comment is compulsory.

This thesis is review-type, and content structure allows to understand easily the relationships between cryobiological, physiological and taxon-specific properties of fish spermatozoa. It is well seen that the author has performed the literature search in a correct way and according to the initial plan of the thesis. I am sure that this work could not be performed without enthusiasm, high motivation and creative contribution of the author.

---

## 3. Work with information

The extent and relevance of used information accessible in the literature, its topicality, truthfulness, complexity, the way of interpretation of the information and extent of information used, the method of description of results and their comparison with other available information, the ability to draw conclusions are evaluated.

**Evaluation** (mark from 1 – the best to 4 – insufficient):  1  2  3  4

**Comment on the evaluation** (justification of the proposed mark). Comment is compulsory.

I am glad to see that the thesis is a result of very deep and detailed study of available literature sources. I know that the real state of the problem is not so easy to assess from available data and the candidate did a really good job in analysis of literature sources. I have evaluated this activity only with mark "2" because of more information can be extracted in the future from the same set of data and I understand that the candidate quite probably had not enough time to perform more sophisticated analysis.

#### 4. Formal processing of the thesis

Compliance with the uniform style, graphic layout, clarity, level of language processing, adherence to the citation standard, quality of graphs and images, etc. are evaluated.

**Evaluation** (mark from 1 – the best to 4 – insufficient):  1  2  3  4

**Comment on the evaluation** (justification of the proposed mark). Comment is compulsory.

The quality of graphs and level of English are sufficient to accept the thesis. Some minor mistakes in English grammar and not extremely original drawings do not allow me to evaluate this point of my review as "1". At the same time, I am sure that overall appearance of the thesis is of good level, especially taking into account that it is the first manuscript of candidate made in English. I also see a perfect job made by the author to deal with really big list of references in a correct way.

---

#### 5. Fulfilment of the thesis's objectives

The comparison of the results of the work with the stated objectives in the assignment is commented and the reasons for the deviations described (unexpected circumstances when solving vs. not keeping the supervisor's instructions by the student, the way of approach to the thesis), i.e. could they be influenced or not by the student's approach.

**Evaluation** (mark from 1 – the best to 4 – insufficient):  1  2  3  4

**Comment on the evaluation** (justification of the proposed mark). Comment is compulsory.

The results of the work correspond well to the stated objectives. The work is performed in a strong accordance to initial plan of the work. I am sure that the presented set of data is a good starting point for the next steps in understanding of the taxon-specific properties of fish spermatozoa in relation to cryopreservation.

## 6. Formulation of the thesis's conclusions

The comprehensibility of the conclusions and their relevance to the findings (scientific or informative) are evaluated.

**Evaluation** (mark from 1 – the best to 4 – insufficient):  1  2  3  4

**Comment on the evaluation** (justification of the proposed mark). Comment is compulsory.

The conclusions are written in a good correspondence to the thesis content. The novelty of gathered information and potential for future use are correctly described.

---

## 7. Professional benefit of the thesis

It is evaluated with regard to the way the work is done and the rate of data extraction, the way of interpretation, the scientific concept of the work, etc.

**Evaluation** (mark from 1 – the best to 4 – insufficient):  1  2  3  4

**Comment on the evaluation** (justification of the proposed mark). Comment is compulsory.

I am sure that the thesis represents quite well arranged core data needed for future steps in reviewing of current state in fish sperm cryopreservation. This set of data will be involved into planned publication of review article in peer-reviewed journal.

---

## Overall evaluation of the thesis:

Proposal of the evaluation with the mark:

- excellent
- very good
- good
- insufficient

I recommend the thesis for defence:

- yes
- no

---

**Questions for defence:**

**Question for defence 1**  
(compulsory)

What is the basic difference in methods of cryopreservation of testicular sperm in teleostean and chondrosteian fish species?

**Question for defence 2**  
(compulsory)

Which devices are used for fish sperm cryopreservation?

---

**Other comments, expressions and suggestions for defence of the thesis, respectively to its further use:**  
(optional)

I am happy to see that really useful information is gathered by Taisiya Stechkina and it will be used in future activity of Laboratory of Reproductive Physiology of Research Institute of Fish Culture and Hydrobiology in field of fish sperm cryopreservation.

---

**Date and signature:**

Date:

22.5.2019

Signature of the student's supervisor:

