

REFERENCE OF BACHELOR THESIS OPPONENT

Study program: SPECIALIZATION IN HEALTH SERVICE - Master degree

Study branch: PHYSIOTHERAPY

Opponent's name:

Bc. Marie Beranová

Author's name:

Stav Alberman

Supervisor's name:

Ph.Dr. Tereza Nováková, Ph.D.

Title of diploma thesis:

Case Study of Physiotherapy Treatment of a Patient with Low Back Pain with Relation to Other Problems in the Motor System

The aim of the diploma thesis:

The aim of this bachelor thesis is to consolidate theoretical information relating to lower back pain with other problems in the motor system and proposing theoretical solutions. The practical aim was a case study of physiotherapeutic care of a patient diagnosed with vertebrogenic algic lower back syndrome.

1. Scope:

| | | | | |
|---|------------|-------------|--------|-------------|
| number of pages of the thesis / text | 86/78 | | | |
| number of used sources | 26 | | | |
| number of used sources - Czech / foreign language | monographs | journals | others | |
| | 0/8 | 0/18 | 0/0 | |
| others | tables | fig./photos | graphs | supplements |
| | 35 | 17 | 0 | 5 |

2. Formal and language level of thesis:

| | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|------|----------------|
| | excellent | very good | good | unsatisfactory |
| degree of fulfillment of the goal of the thesis | x | | | |
| work with literature, use of citation standard | | | X | |
| work editing (text, graphs, pictures, tables) | | | x | |
| stylistic level of the text | | x | | |

3. Criteria for evaluating the special part of the work:

| | | | | |
|--|----------------------|-----------|------|----------------|
| | degree of evaluation | | | |
| | excellent | very good | good | unsatisfactory |
| quality of the content and processing the theoretical part | | x | | |
| logical structure of work and balance of chapters | x | | | |
| chosen examination techniques, design and their recording | x | | | |
| adequacy, quality of therapeutic intervention and its recording | X | | | |
| ability to evaluate the intervention and interpretation of the results | x | | | |
| level of work evaluation in relation to current knowledge | X | | | |

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

above average average below average

5. Additional commentary and evaluation, questions for defense:

The task of the bachelor's thesis was, in my opinion, fulfilled. The work has a clear structure and it is clearly written. From my personal observation, the author's approach to the patient was positive and professional. It is clear from the text that the author is well-orientated in the topic. I would like to acknowledge and commend the quality and detailed processing of the practical part, especially the records of individual therapies.

However I have few comments about the formal aspects of the thesis. In the Reference List there are a few inaccuracies, especially in monographs. In the List of Pictures, sources for pictures number 13 and 17 are not mentioned, however it is correctly mentioned in the text. Quotations meet standards according to APA. There are grammatical mistakes throughout the thesis, however the style is consistent and meaning is always clear. There are also a stylistic mistake in the abstract: the placement of the terms "*subjectively*" and "*objectively*" should be swapped, however the terms are used correctly in other parts of the text. Page numbers don't match with the Table of Contents. I have no question.

6. Statement of the supervisor:

I declare that after studying the whole work I found that in the work the referenced sources are properly cited or paraphrased.

7. Recommendation for defense:

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

8. Proposed classification level:

Excellent + according defense

In Prague on: 14.6.2020

Bc. Marie Beranová

supervisor's signature