

# **Survey of UAVs (Drones) in the Field of Electronic Communications**

**by Vladimir Chott**

**Assessment by Kenneth Froehling, M.A.**

## **Scope of Work**

The aim of this 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 aspect and legal implications, including regulations in selected countries which are cited in Chapter 5.

## **Grammar**

Overall, the grammar and sentence structures is OK, but a few grammar and spelling mistakes can be found. The use of vocabulary, though, lacks variety, especially in the “Conclusion” where “some” appears four times in the middle of the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph (p.47).

## **Style**

This thesis is uneven in my opinion, especially in the length of paragraphs and the division of chapters. For example, in Chapter 1 (p.15), Mr. Chott has five different subsections, each one consisting of only three lines! More importantly and critically, his citations and references are done very poorly, an important aspect which is addressed below.

## **Contents**

One of the few pluses in this paper are the photographs of the different UAVs which Mr. Chott inserted into his thesis. In addition, he gives a credible explanation of the differences between UAVs and drone.

On the negative side, though, Mr. Chott never followed by advice on how to do citations, and when he did, he got everything backwards. In fact, I found him very obtuse about this aspect! During his semester project, I warned him about “plagiarism” (e.g. with Reg Austin’s book), so all he did was to just put [1] next to nearly everything to cover himself on plagiarism—but he didn’t even add the page number for a book of 332 pages. In addition, in the thesis he not only repeated this mistake, but he basically kept the same order and changed only a few words from what Austin and other authors wrote, hardly ever using quotation marks too. I warned about this again when he sent me Chapter 4, but again being obtuse, he sent me the bounded final copy of his thesis just before the deadline, with Chapters 4, 5 and 6 having the exact same error.

Moreover, when I checked some of his Internet sources, I sometimes was unable to find what he referenced, and when I did, it was “risible” (on p. 45, line 6, he changed the cited material about old airplane cockpits having 5 crew members to “more than four crew members”—which is not the same thing! In my opinion, a 3<sup>rd</sup>-year student should know how to use proper citations.

The most serious flaw, however, is in Chapter 5. Mr. Chott lists the laws and regulations regarding drones in several countries, but totally ignored doing any research on the Czech Republic, because he only cites some of the countries from P.E. Ross' work (giving no reasons why he left out the other countries). My guess is that since Mr. Ross did not include the Czech Republic, Mr. Chott felt no need to include it either—since it would have meant him doing extra research for his thesis!

### **Final Assessment**

Mr. Chott did the minimum amount of work needed to pass his thesis, so he deserves the minimum passing mark of

**50%/E/dostatečně**