



Přírodovědecká
fakulta
Faculty
of Science

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

STATEMENT OF THE BACHELOR/DIPLOMA* THESIS REVIEWER

Name of the student: Bär Anita

Thesis title: Functional analysis of Tb927.9.2900, a protein involved in pre-18S rRNA processing in *Trypanosoma brucei*.

Supervisor: RNDr. Drahomíra Faktorová, Ph.D.

Reviewer: RNDr. Zdeněk Paris, Ph.D.

Reviewer's affiliation: Institute of Parasitology, Biology Centre, Czech Academy of Sciences and Faculty of Science, University of South Bohemia, 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	3
quality of the theoretical part (review) (number and relevancy of the references, recency of the references)	0-3	3
Accuracy in citing of the references (presence of uncited sources, uniform style of the references, use of correct journal titles and abbreviations)	0-3	3
Graphic layout of the text and of the figures/tables	0-3	3
Quality of the annotation	0-3	3
Language and stylistics, complying with the valid terminology	0-3	2
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		20

(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 the results and their discussion with the literature (absence of discussion with the literature is not acceptable)	0-3	3
Logic in the course of the experimental work	0-3	3
Completeness of the description of the used techniques	0-3	3

* Choose one

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

Experimental difficulty of the thesis, independence in experimental work	0-3	3
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	3
Practical requirements – points in total		27
POINTS IN TOTAL (MAX/AWARDED)		48
		47

Comments of the reviewer on the student and the thesis:

- 1) Very well written thesis, which reads well and it has minimum typos and grammar errors. However, it contains several expressions, which are not common in scientific language.
- 2) I appreciate very detailed methodology of the thesis.
- 3) Previous work of lab members or collaborators is clearly stated in the thesis and distinguished from the contribution of the student.
- 4) Page 7: Do you think, that efficiency of RNAi in *T. brucei* is comparable for all mRNAs?
- 5) Page 29, Growth curves: Why did you expect, that RNAi of the nucleolar protein will result in a stronger phenotype in low glucose media? Did you expect TbUTP10 to be involved in mitochondrial functions? Why?
- 6) Page 36: I really, appreciate the color code used for the three different probes. It makes it much easier for the reader. However, how do you explain that the signal detected by the green probe (5'ETS) in lane I1 is 50% lower than in the WT? It should be theoretically stronger. Did you normalize the signal using loading control? How many times did you repeat this Northern blot analysis?
- 7) Page 39, Polysome profiles: What is your explanation of the increased 60S peak after RNAi of TbUTP10?
- 8) Page 40: Part "Discussion and conclusion" nicely sums up all the obtained data. Nevertheless, it should not only repeat the results but also interpret them in a broader context.
- 9) Except for a few minor points mentioned above, I am completely satisfied with the quality of the thesis.

10)

Conclusion:

In conclusion, I

r e c o m m e n d

the thesis for the defense and I suggest the grade 1 .²

In České Budějovice date 13.9.2017


RNDr. Zdeněk Paris, Ph.D.

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.