

MASTER THESIS REVIEW

THESIS AUTHOR: Tina Pourpakhdelvekr

TOPIC: Potential of Smart City through Modeling of Single Crossing (Case Study: Olomouc)

BRANCH OF STUDY: Foresight for environment and development

AUTHOR OF REVIEW: Lucie Macková, Ph.D.

EVALUATION, PART 1: CONTENT OF THE THESIS	
To what extent is the thesis structure logical and coherent? Did the author answer research questions? What has been achieved in terms of its objectives?	A
How complex and how well applied is the methodology of the thesis?	A
What is the quality of the content of the thesis? Are there any factual mistakes? Are the facts and described relations interpreted correctly? Did the author use appropriate terminology?	A
How well – in terms of depth and quality – did the author analyse the topic?	A

Verbal assessment:

The thesis attempts to analyse the potential of smart cities through single crossing modelling. The theory is state of the art and it discusses smart cities in academic literature and smart mobility. Furthermore, the thesis proposes an algorithm for the optimization of T-junctions in Olomouc. The thesis offers three different scenarios (for peak period, off-peak period and for increasing the capacity). The final chapter of the thesis (which could perhaps be longer) discusses conclusions and recommendations. The methodology is complex and works well with the case study. The structure of the thesis could perhaps be simplified and there is less focus in the theoretical part (sometimes there is superfluous information). The analysis at hand and the presented findings are interesting and well within the scope of Urban Studies and Foresight.

EVALUATION, PART 2: LITERATURE AND SOURCES CITED IN THE THESIS	
To what extent does the author use suitable sources? Is the quantity of cited sources appropriate for a master thesis?	B
What is the quality of citations and references? Are the sources traceable?	A

Verbal assessment:

The thesis uses suitable sources but there is less interaction and comparison among them. Usually, it only lists the authors and their findings without further discussion. Sometimes there are paragraphs citing precise information without mentioning the sources (e.g., on p. 10).

EVALUATION, PART 3: FORMAL REQUIREMENTS	
What is the stylistic and grammar level of the thesis?	B
Is the format of the thesis in accordance with the usual standards of academic works? Does the graphic layout contribute positively to the quality of the thesis?	B

Verbal assessment:

Spacing of the thesis is a bit dense to read. There are some typos (such as “ques”, “the Czechia”) in the text and inconsistent use of British and American English (modelling/modeling). Many acronyms used in the work (e.g. RHODES, SYLVIA, MTL, ...) are neither explained nor listed

in the List of abbreviations and acronyms at the beginning of the thesis, which makes it difficult to follow the text.

POINTS FOR DISCUSSION DURING THE THESIS DEFENCE
What are the future avenues to present your findings and recommendations?
Can any aspect of your thesis be transposed to other cities?

OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE THESIS	
Verbal assessment: The thesis represents a solid piece of work but could perhaps be improved in terms of clarity and structure. It shows an excellent understanding of the topic and presents interesting findings that could be further developed and perhaps extended to other cities.	
Proposed grade:	A

DATE: 30/07/2021

SIGNATURE: _____