

## Evaluation of bachelor thesis: supervisor's opinion

Author of the thesis: Sofie Dundrová

Title of the thesis: The role of cyclic nucleotides in plant signalling

**Assessment of individual aspects of work (evaluate with a standard scale 1 to 4)**

**1. Self-sufficiency of the student:**

At the stage of topic refinement: 1

When working with literature and databases: 1

During literature survey (continuity and responsibility): 2

During text processing: 3

**2. Communicativeness, ability to cooperate: 1**

**3. Student's enthusiasm and diligence: 2**

**4. Reliability and fulfilment of assigned tasks: 3**

**Possible comments to the above points, additional remarks on the course of work**

Sofie Dundrová started to work on the thesis before leaving for an Erasmus internship, and then she interrupted her efforts. However, after a long communication gap, she came to me with an elaborated outline of the work from which it was obvious that she familiarized herself with the available literature. Therefore, we resumed the work on the thesis this spring. Sofie read a lot of papers, she created extensive notes from research articles, she built up tables of proteins with cyclase and phosphodiesterase activities. My impression was that she spent a significant amount of time with the relevant literature.

However, it seems that creating the final product – the actual text of the thesis, was a difficult task for Sofie. Instead of writing the thesis chapters, she kept on reading further papers and making notes. Therefore, she got into a significant delay, and the last chapters of the thesis were written in a rush during the last days and nights before the submission deadline. Because of this, me and the consultant (Lorena Huffer), could not help Sofie with some parts of the text, and the thesis is thus genuinely her piece of work. Because of the final rush, the thesis does not contain any figures or the mentioned tables of proteins, which I think is a pity.

On the other hand, Sofie wrote her text in a very good English, she seemed to understand the source literature and explain it well, the writing was thoughtful and full of the views of the author on the problematic.

**Opinion on the correction(s) of errors:**

Errata / correction in the text ~~IS~~ / **IS NOT** (strike out or delete what does not apply) the requirement for the thesis acceptance.

**Overall assessment**

I recommend that the thesis be accepted for further processing: **YES** / ~~**NO**~~

Supervisor's final classification proposal:

2 - very good

Date: 31<sup>st</sup> August 2024

Name and surname, signature of the reviewer (according to SIS):  
Matyas Fendrych

**Instructions for the preparation and submission of the review (delete after completing the review):**

- According to the University rules, the opinion must be made available to the student at least three working days prior defence.
- You can submit the fulfilled form by yourself to the SIS or send it in advance electronically to: hana.konradova@natur.cuni.cz. **Furthermore, please, ensure the delivery of the signed original printout to the secretary's office of the Department of Experimental Plant Biology, Faculty of Science, Charles University, Viničná 5, 128 44 Praha 2.** The signed printed copy of the opinion must be delivered in advance, without it the defence cannot start!