

OPPONENT'S EVALUATION REPORT OF DIPLOMA THESIS

Study program: SPECIALIZATION IN HEALTH SERVICE - Master degree

Study branch: PHYSIOTHERAPY

Opponent's name:	Mgr. Helena Vomáčková
Author's name:	Bc. Salem Baqhoum
Supervisor's name:	PhDr. Tereza Nováková, Ph.D
Consultant's name:	Mgr. Jan Vávra

The title of the diploma thesis:

Effectiveness of Ankle and Foot joint mobilization for Improving Stability Analysed by Computerized Dynamic Posturography

The aim of the diploma thesis:

The aim of the thesis was to evaluate the effect of the manual joint mobilisation of the ankle and foot on the selected factors given form the NeuroCom Smart EquiTest System evaluating the dynamic balance

1. Scope:

number of pages of the thesis / text	74/51			
number of used sources	76			
others	tables	fig./photos	graphs	supplements
	18	24	0	3

2. Formal and language level of the thesis:

	excellent	very good	good	unsatisfactory
choice and definition of the topic, originality	x			
degree of fulfilment of the goal of the thesis		x		
logical structure of the thesis	x			
work with literature, use of citation standard			x	
<i>The references used in the work does not fully corresponds to the listed resources (e.g.: figure 5, ...)</i>				
work editing (text, graphs, pictures, tables)			x	
stylistic level of the text		x		

3. Evaluating criteria of the theoretical part of the thesis:

	excellent	very good	good	unsatisfactory
analysis and interpretation of literary review		x		
application of bibliography results for connection to the experimental part			x	

4. Evaluating criteria of the special part of the thesis:

	degree of evaluation			
	excellent	very good	good	unsatisfactory
hypotheses - relevance and quality of their definition		x		
<i>The specification between dynamic and static stability or static and dynamic balance is not well defined in all the hypothesis neither in the theoretical part. The research question is not designed as a question.</i>				
research set - adequacy of selection	x			
<i>The study includes 40 participants randomly selected into experimental and control group, that's why the set is well designed.</i>				
methodology - used evaluation methods and their quality		x		
<i>DCP - dynamic computer analysis is one of the actual method describing dynamic postural control. The chosen protocols, specifically SOT, LOS and MCT were well selected. I miss the information of the subjective examination of the joint play in the ankle joint - I would appreciate the information of the barrier and joint play of probands.</i>				
results - presentation and interpretation			x	
<i>Figure 16 and 17 - does not have the information of references. Figure 18 - from the name of the figure and the heading is not capable, what the figure exactly shows. Table 10 - the information of the described data is missing. Table 13 - the explanation of the results in table is missing. From the text is not clear what the SOM, VIS and VEST ratios means. The concrete explanation of the meaning of the result is missing. From the text is not clear haw the author had obtained the values - if he uses the mean values or not. If yes, than the standard deviation of values would also describe the character od data</i>				
statistical processing and data analysis	x			
<i>The used methods are well designed for comparing the results difference. The statistical analysis by the two sample t-test were used to evaluate the significant difference of <0.05 P-value.</i>				
discussion - interpretation of results in relation to current knowledge		x		

All the hypothesis are discussed in this part of the thesis within the aspect of the correct researches.

conclusion - self-evaluation level of the thesis		x		
<i>The author of the thesis is able to conclude the final results and also the limitations of the work.</i>				

4. Usefulness of the results of the thesis in practice:

above average	average	below average
---------------	---------	---------------

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

Despite the objections mentioned above, the work meets the demands of the master thesis. Questions to the defence: The figure 5 shows the details about the examined parameters, why you have not examined the MXE also to RT and BW direction? Please, clarify what stability - dynamic or static was improved after one-time passive joint mobilization of ankle according to Lewit? Which exact techniques, its repetition you have used? Have you did the mobilisation on joints without lacking the joint play?

6. Statement of the opponent:

I can not fully declare that all referenced sources are properly cited or paraphrased in the thesis. The resources of some figures are not correct. There is no evidence of any electronic resources in the thesis.

7. Recommendation for defence:

yes	yes with reservations	no
-----	-----------------------	----

8. Proposed classification level:

very good (according the defence)

In Prague: 10.6.2020

opponent's signature