BACHELOR THESIS OPPONENT´S REFERENCE

Study program: SPECIALIZATION IN HEALTH SERVICE - Bachelor degree
Study branch: PHYSIOTHERAPY

Opponent's name:	Mgr. Markéta Kučerová
Author´s name:	Seyed Sadrodin Nourbakhsh
Supervisor's name:	Mgr. Ilona Kučerová

The title of the bachelor thesis:

Case Study of Physiotherapy Treatment of a Patient with the Diagnose of peripheral ankylosing spondylitis

The aim of the bachelor thesis:

This thesis' major objective is to provide an overview of the topic of ankylosing spondylitis, including distinct kinds of the condition and available therapies, from both a theoretical and practical standpoint.

1. Scope:

number of thesis / text pages	84/72 (80 including *Content* and *Work cited*)			
number of used sources	46 (sources are not numbered)			
number of used sources - English / foreign language	monographs	journals		others
	0/7	0/39		0/0
others	tables	fig./photos	graphs	supplements
	43	0	0	3

31/46 sources are elder than 10 years!

2. Formal and language level of thesis:	excellent	very good	good	unsatisfactory
fulfillment degree of the thesis goal	x			
work with literature, use of citation standard				x
work editing (text, graphs, pictures, tables)		x		
level of the text style		x		

	degree of evaluation			
3. Evaluating criteria of the thesis:	excellent	very good	good	unsatisfactory
quality of the theoretical content and processing		x		
logical structure of the thesis and balance of the chapters		x		
chosen examination techniques, design and their recording	x			
chosen therapeutic techniques, design and their recording		x		
ability to evaluate the intervention and interpretation of the results		x		
level of the work evaluation in relation to current knowledge		x		

4. Usefulness of the thesis results in practice:	~~above average~~	average	~~below average~~

5. Additional commentary and evaluation, questions for the defense:

Questions

1. What year was the latest update of ASAS classification criteria for axial and peripheral spondyloarthritis?
2. Did you measure chest expansion in your patient? Why should it be measured in AS patients (in context of classification criteria of AS)? In what parts of chest is it possible to measure it?
3. How could you correct patients posture?

4. How could your patient activate deep stabilization system – more options?
+
General part
I really appreciate the broad view of the topic AS, especially chapters 2.5 Clinical Features of AS, 2.7 Differential diagnosis – it is very usefull and important in practice. Chapter 2.9 about comorbid conditions and difficulties is very practical too.
Chapter 2.14 broadly evaluates current informations about physical therapy efectiveness (Meta-analyses, trials).
Special Part
Therapeutic plans are very detailed and good fitting for the patient.
I appreciate the therapies were focused on many of patients difficulties.
-
List of Abbreviations is missing.
Content is not well-arranged, all chapter levels are the same font size and indentation.
Chapters 2. 3, 2. 4 are missing, (there is 2.2 Patophysiology and than 2.5 Clinical Features of AS)
General part could be better structured. AS classification criteria should be more up-to-date, ASAS (Assessment of SpondyloArthritis international Society) classification criteria are mentioned in chapter 2.1, but in chapter 2.6 Screening and diagnosis are missing.
Pg. 11 Chapter 2. 11 Medical management: Information about DMARDs (sulfasalazine, methotrexate) and about biologics (TNF Inhibitors, IL Inhibitors) is missing.
Special Part
Joint play of spine, ribs and upper limbs is missing.
Pg. 34 3.3.5 Gait Examination is unsatisfactory initially, but it is included in third session (pg. 51).
Posture correction is missing in therapeutic plan and therapies, although activation of the deep stabilization system is included, but only 1 exercise.
Work Cited
Pg. 8 (Moore, 2014), Pg 16 (Peters et al 2009), (Kaan & Ferda, 2005), (Mattey, 2011) Pg. 17 (Kotler, 2000), (De Keyser, & Mielants, 2003), (Lavie et. Al. , 2009) are not in Work Cited.

6. Statement of the supervisor:

I declare that all referenced sources are properly cited or paraphrased in the thesis.

7. Recommendation for the defense:

yes	~~yes with reservations~~	~~no~~

8. Proposed classification level: *according to the defense*

In Prague:

opponent's signature