

POSUDEK OPONENTA MAGISTERSKÉ DIPLOMOVÉ PRÁCE

OPPONENT'S REPORT OF THE MASTER THESIS

Opponent's name: Mgr. Helena Vomáčková

Leadership's name: doc. PaedDr. Dagmar Pavlů, CSc.

Student's name: Mohammed Saqqa

The title of the bachelor thesis: Comparison between the effectiveness of ESWT and the surgical approach in the treatment of the rotator cuff tendinopathy: a literature review

The goal of the bachelor thesis: The aim of this literature review was to compare the effectiveness of an extracorporeal shock wave therapy and the surgical intervention in the treatment of calcific rotator cuff tendinopathy. The thesis is the systematic literature review and it finally compares 33 studies published between the year 2000 and 2016.

1. Volume:

pages of the work/pages of the text	88/70			
number of references	151			
	articles	monographs	electronic sources	other
	148	2	1	0
others	figures	tables	graphs	appendices
	12	2	0	0

2. Seriousness of topics:

	above average	average	under average	unsatisfactory
theoretical knowledge		X		
<i>The theory part follows the information and knowledges about the anatomy, rotator cuff tendinopathy and the management of the disease. Unfortunately I do miss the detailed information about the output parameters (energy density, ...) of SWT in the</i>				
input data and their processing		X		
<i>The theory part contains adequate chapters to describe chosen topic.</i>				
used methods		X		

3. Criteria of thesis classification:

	degree of evaluation			
	excellent	very good	satisfactory	unsatisfactory
depth of analysis of thesis		X		
<i>The aim of the thesis was fulfilled.</i>				
logical construction of work	X			
<i>The work follows the requirements of the "literature review".</i>				
work with literature and citations	X			
<i>Citations are processed according to the current standards of APA and the student has demonstrated the ability to work with actual information.</i>				
adequacy of used methods		X		
<i>Used method fulfilled the requirements of the master thesis. There is a lack of the students own opinion in the Discussion (p. 62).</i>				
design of work (text, graphs, tables)	X			
<i>Thesis has well organized design, all the tables are easy to understand.</i>				
stylistic level	X			
<i>Thesis has good stylistic level, there is only few misspelling.</i>				

4. Usefulness of the thesis outcomes: under-average average above-average

5. Comments and questions to answer:

The quality of the whole thesis is satisfactory. I do recommend the thesis to defence. I do appreciate that student has discussed by himself also the limitations of the thesis - mainly the retrospective nature of the used astroscopic studies. There is no significant clear answer to the research questions in the discussions. That's why I ask the student to formularise the unambiguous answer to the research questions during the defence. *Question: How you can explain that not every study have shown the significant improvement regarding the subjective pain (VAS)? Can be the age of the patients also the limitation of the design of the work?*

6. Recommendation for defence: NO YES

7. Designed classificatory degree excellent-very good (according to student's defence)

Date: in Prague 11.9.2018

signature of the opponent