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Scope of Work

The aim of Mr. Chott’s thesis is to survey unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) and assess its impact in the field of electronic communications. The first three chapters define and categorize several UAVs, both commercial and non-commercial. Mr. Chott also focuses on the cultural aspects and legal implications, including regulations in selected countries which are cited in chapter 5.

Grammar & Vocabulary

Overall, the grammar and sentences structures is OK, but a few grammar and spelling mistakes can be found (see “Contents” below). The vocabulary, however, lacks variety, especially in the “Conclusion” where the word “some” appears 4 times in the middle of the 3rd paragraph (p.47).

Style

This thesis is not cleanly written in my opinion. In chapter 1 (p.15), Mr. Chott has five different subsections, each one consisting of only three lines! More importantly, his citations and references are done poorly, an important point which I will address below.

Contents

Regarding one of the few pluses in this paper, I really like the photographs of the different UAVs which Mr. Chott inserted into his thesis. Moreover, he gives a credible explanation of the differences between UAVs and drones.

On the negative side, Mr. Chott never followed my advice, both during the writing of his thesis and his earlier semester project, on how to do citations, and when he did, he got everything backwards. I warned him about plagiarism (for example, with Reg Austin’s book), so the end result was that he just put [1] next to all Reg Austin quotes—without even the page number for a book that is 332 pages. Fortunately, I was familiar with it, so I found the pages. However, in his thesis, I noticed that Vladimir kept basically the same order and changed only a few words from what Austin and other authors wrote (Vladimir hardly ever used quotation marks too). I warned him about “not” doing this, but he kept doing so anyway. In fact, I last warned him about this when he sent me Chapter 4, but instead he sent me the final copy just before the deadline with this mistake hardly corrected in Chapter 4, but in addition, making the exact same error in Chapters 5 & 6. Also, with other Internet sources, I couldn’t find the information in the sources
he referenced and when I did, it was “risible” (on p. 45, line 6, he changed old airplane cockpits having 5 crew members cited in the article to “more than four crew members”—which is not the same thing! The point is that Mr. Chott is a 3rd-year student who should know how to use proper citations.

However, the most serious flaw of his work is in Chapter 5 where he lists the laws and regulations regarding drones in several countries, but totally ignores doing any research on the Czech Republic, because he only cites some of the countries from P.E. Ross’ work (giving no reason why he left out the other countries). The point is that Ross did not include the Czech Republic, so Mr. Chott decided not to include it—probably because it would have meant doing extra research on his part!

**Final Assessment**

Mr. Chott, in my opinion, did the minimum amount of work needed to pass his thesis, so he deserves the minimum passing marking of

**50%/E/ dostatečně**