



Přirodovědecká
fakulta
Faculty
of Science

Jihočeská univerzita
v Českých Budějovicích
University of South Bohemia
in České Budějovice

STATEMENT OF THE BACHELOR * THESIS REVIEWER

Name of the student: Ana-Marija Andova

Thesis title: Determining the subcellular compartment in which the unique cleavage of mitochondrial F₁ ATPase subunit alpha happens

Supervisor: RNDr. Alena Panicucci Zíková, Ph.D.
Co-supervisor: Bc. Brian Panicucci

Reviewer: Corinna Benz, Ph.D.
Reviewer` affiliation: Institute of Parasitology, Biology Centre, Czech Academy of Sciences, České Budějovice, Czech Republic

| | Point scale ¹ | Points |
|--|--------------------------|--------|
| (1) FORMAL REQUIREMENTS | | |
| Extent of the thesis (for bachelor theses min. 18 pages, for masters theses min. 25 pages), balanced length of the thesis parts (recommended length of the theoretical part is max. 1/3 of the total length), logical structure of the thesis | 0-3 | 2 |
| quality of the theoretical part (review) (number and relevancy of the references, recency of the references) | 0-3 | 1 |
| Accuracy in citing of the references (presence of uncited sources, uniform style of the references, use of correct journal titles and abbreviations) | 0-3 | 1 |
| Graphic layout of the text and of the figures/tables | 0-3 | 3 |
| Quality of the annotation | 0-3 | 2 |
| Language and stylistics, complying with the valid terminology | 0-3 | 3 |
| Accuracy and completeness of figures/tables legends (clarity without reading the rest of the text, explanation of the symbols and labeling, indication of the units) | 0-3 | 3 |
| Formal requirements – points in total | | 15 |
| (2) PRACTICAL REQUIREMENTS | | |
| Clarity and fulfillment of the aims | 0-3 | 3 |
| Ability to understand the results, their interpretation, and clarity of the results, discussion, and conclusions | 0-3 | 3 |
| Discussion quality – interpretation of results and their discussion with the literature (absence of discussion with the literature is not acceptable) | 0-3 | 3 |

* Choose one

¹ Mark as: 0-unsatisfactory, 1-satisfactory, 2-average, 3-excellent.

| | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| Logic in the course of the experimental work | 0-3 | 3 |
| Completeness of the description of the used techniques | 0-3 | 3 |
| Experimental difficulty of the thesis, independence in experimental work | 0-3 | 2 |
| Quality of experimental data presentation | 0-3 | 3 |
| The use of up-to-date techniques | 0-3 | 3 |
| Contribution of the thesis to the knowledge in the field and possibility to publish the results (after eventual supplementary experiments) | 0-3 | 2 |
| Formal requirements – points in total | | 25 |
| POINTS IN TOTAL (MAX/AWARDED) | | |
| | 48 | 40 |

Suggestions and questions, to which the student has to answer during the defense:

- What other methods of subcellular localization can you think of? Would they work for you here?
- How many proteases are there in the *T. brucei* mitochondrion?
- How would you try and determine which one is responsible for the cleavage of alpha?

Eventual mistakes, which the students should avoid in the future:

- The student should be more careful when citing references, e.g. she spends a whole paragraph describing mitochondrial protein import in general but cites only one *T. brucei*-specific paper for it. In addition, reference number 11 is the same as 21. Some references are missing journal titles or page numbers.
- Minor mistakes in the list of abbreviations (definition of LB, PCR) and typos (?) in the introduction ("insert vector" instead of insect vector)

Eventual additional comments of the reviewer on the student and the thesis:

- Overall the thesis is very well written
- Materials and method section is very thorough but maybe a bit too long in respect to the results section (twice as long)
- I liked the discussion and it already answered a few of the questions I had


Conclusion:

In conclusion, I

r e c o m m e n d

the thesis for the defense and I suggest the grade 2 .²

In České Budějovice, date 10.1.2020

.....

signature

² You can suggest a grade, which can be modified during the defense based on the presentation. However, if the reviewer is not present at the defense, the grade will not be counted.