

Course of the defence:

THE SUPERVISOR INTRODUCED THE STUDENT. THE STUDENT PRESENTED THE RESULTS OF HER DISSERTATION TO THE COMMITTEE. THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ACQUAINTED THE COMMITTEE WITH OPPONENTS' REVIEWS. THE STUDENT THEN ANSWERED ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS:

IDENTIFICATION OF SUMATRA BARB ^{IS} ~~AN~~ DIFFICULT - IT IS A COMPLEX OF THREE SPECIES. IS IT POSSIBLE TO USE THE IMAGES OF SUBADULTS FOR FURTHER IMAGE IDENTIFICATIONS? WHAT TIME IS NEEDED FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF ONE FISH?

HOW TO SOLVE THE PROBLEM WITH SCALE GROWTH AND/OR REGENERATION? DO YOU HAVE SOME CONTACTS OR CONSULTATIONS WITH FARMERS REGARDING APPLICABILITY OF YOUR CONCLUSIONS?

HOW IS YOUR PROCEDURE APPLICABLE IN MIRROR CARP?

HOW DID YOU VERIFY FISH IDENTITY?

IS THERE ANY EFFORT TO FOLLOW THE PATTERN DEVELOPMENT WITH TIME?

WHAT WAS THE REASON FOR TESTING TWO PARAMETERISATION APPROACHES?

Score:

Assessment: PASSED

Date of defence: 14.9.2022



committee chairman