

<b>Posudek na bakalářskou práci</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> školitelský posudek <input type="checkbox"/> oponentský posudek	Jméno posuzovatele: <b>Robert Tropek</b> Datum: 27.5.2019
Autor: Dominik Anýž	
Název práce: The importance of butterflies in the pollination of flowering plants	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Práce je literární rešerší ve smyslu zveřejněných požadavků (pravidel). <input type="checkbox"/> Práce obsahuje navíc i vlastní výsledky.	
<b>Cíle práce (předmět rešerše, pracovní hypotéza...)</b>  <p>The thesis aimed reviewing of available knowledge on butterflies as pollinators. This issue has not been easy because the literature is often constrained by several “classic” studies with various methodological and interpretative biases. Moreover, the undoubtful differences among individual butterfly families (or smaller groups) of butterflies are not respected in most existing studies. Dominik was supposed to make these clear and to review which groups butterflies act as efficient pollinators under what circumstances and vice versa. Surprisingly, any relevant review on this topic has not been published yet.</p>	
Struktura (členění) práce:  <p>The thesis has two parts, the first focuses on traits of butterflies and plants with emphases on the psychophilous pollination syndrome, the second reviews studies on butterfly pollination efficiency.</p>	
Jsou použité literární zdroje dostatečné a jsou v práci správně citovány? Použil(a) autor(ka) v rešerši relevantní údaje z literárních zdrojů?  <p>In my opinion, the number and scope of cited studies is adequate to the standard BSc thesis and nothing crucial is missing.</p>	
Pokud práce obsahuje (nadstandardně) i vlastní výsledky, jsou tyto výsledky adekvátním způsobem získány, zhodnoceny a diskutovány?  <p>The thesis does not contain any own data.</p>	
Formální úroveň práce (obrazová dokumentace, grafika, text, jazyková úroveň):  <p>I strongly appreciate Dominik has decided to write the thesis in English. Besides being important for his development, it will be also much easier to turn it into the scientific manuscript after the necessary changes and improvements. As in many other cases, the thesis has been written in the relatively last moments and I have thus not had any opportunity to read its final version. However, many its parts have substantially improved from the version I have seen a week prior to the submission and are of a high quality; this applies especially for the first part. Nevertheless, while reading its second part I have been meeting more formal and language issues but still hardly exceeding the “standard” BSc thesis.</p>	

**Splnění cílů práce a celkové hodnocení:**

The two thesis parts vary in their quality. Although I can find some gaps in interpretation of findings in the first part, I consider it to be such good and comprehensive review, it should not be a big problem turning it into a publishable text. Of course, better summary of the results will be needed, especially in terms of differences among the butterfly families, but this can be stated on most BSc theses, including the best ones.

Contrastingly, I have not been so excited when reading the second part. Although it reviews **a lot of** studies, I hardly find any critical summary of their methods, results and interpretations. In the first place, it lacks a good definition of the basic issues: i.e. the real definition of pollination efficiency and any good review of morphological and behavioural differences among butterfly families. Unfortunately, it does not stand on the great first part, which should be taken as the base. As the results, some differences among the families have been detected but they are hardly explained or even properly discussed. The final result that butterfly families strongly differ in their efficiency of pollination is adequate and highly valuable, but it would deserve much more detailed critical discussion of its reasons and consequences.

In conclusion, if I could evaluate the two thesis parts separately, the first one would get the best (“výborně”) grade, whilst the second would be rather average or even slightly below the average (“trochu horší dvojka”), mainly because of the lack of proper discussion. Nevertheless, I will decide between “výborně” and “velmi dobře” after the defence.

**Otázky a připomínky oponenta:**

The questions should be on the reviewer.

**Návrh hodnocení školitele nebo oponenta**

výborně  velmi dobře  dobře  nevyhověl(a)

Podpis školitele/opponenta:

**Instrukce pro vyplnění:**

- Prosíme oponenty i školitele o co nejstručnější a nejvýstižnější komentáře k jednotlivým bodům (dodržujte zhruba rozsah), tučně vyznačené rubriky jsou povinnou součástí posudku.
- Při posuzování je nutno zohlednit požadavky stanovené pro vypracování bakalářských prací – viz <https://www.natur.cuni.cz/biologie/ekologie/studium/bakalarky>.
- Posudek se odevzdává (zasílá) v elektronické podobě na e-mail: [kubicka@natur.cuni.cz](mailto:kubicka@natur.cuni.cz) (pro účely zveřejnění na internetu), a dále podepsaný v 1 výtisku (jako součást protokolu o obhajobě) na adresu Lukáš Kubička, katedra ekologie PŘF UK, Viničná 7, 128 43 Praha 2.