BACHELOR THESIS SUPERVISOR'S REFERENCE

| Study program: SPECIALIZATION IN HEALTH SERVICE - Bachelor degree Study branch: PHYSIOTHERAPY | | | | |
|---|---|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Author's name: | Maie Alabed | | | |
| Supervisor's name: | Mgr. Michaela Stupková | | | |
| | | | | |
| The title of the bachelor thesis: | | | | |
| Physiotherapy Rehabilitation After Total Hip Replacement | | | | |
| The aim of the bachelor thesis: | | | | |
| Application of comprehensive theoretical findings of the hip joint, coxarthrosis, ar arthroplasty diagnosis and subsequent physiotherapeutic rehabilitation care. | nd exercising of | practical knowl | edge related to | total hip |
| 1. Scope: number of thesis / text pages | 02/72 | | | |
| number of used sources | 82/73 52 | | | |
| number of used sources - English / foreign language | monographs | | rnals | others |
| | 18/0 | 34/0 | | 0/0 |
| others | tables | fig./photos | graphs | supplement |
| | 35 | 3/0 | 0 | 5 |
| 2. Formal and language level of thesis: | excellent | very good | good | unsatisfactor |
| independence of the student in the processing of the thesis | Х | very good | 8000 | unsatisfactor |
| fulfillment degree of the thesis goal | Х | | | |
| work with literature, use of citation standard | | | х | |
| | Author does not keep the correct APA citing | | | |
| work editing (text, graphs, pictures, tables) | | Х | | |
| level of the text style | | Х | | |
| | | | | |
| A resident to the design of the other than the | | | evaluation | |
| 3. Evaluating criteria of the thesis: quality of the theoretical content and processing | excellent x | very good | good | unsatisfacto |
| I would like to appreciate the description of dynamics and statics of the hip joint | | ne pelvis and lui | | l biomechanic ait with a cane |
| logical structure of the thesis and balance of chapters | | х | , g. | |
| | Sc | ome facts are no | ot written in log | gical sequence |
| chosen examination techniques, design and their recording | Х | | | |
| | _ | | | |
| chosen therapeutic techniques, design and their recording | | Х | | |
| | ysical therapy p | roposal is not c | oncerned in the | therapy plan |
| ability to evaluate the intervention and interpretation of the results | Х | | | |
| level of the work evaluation in relation to surrent knowledge | v | | | |
| level of the work evaluation in relation to current knowledge | Х | | | |

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

4. Usefulness of the thesis results in practice:

Questions: 1. Is it possible to asses the Vele test if the patient is not able fully load lower extremity? 2. Could you propose some physical therapy for the patient after the THR? You assed the deep stabilization system as less activated in the kinesiological examination. Why this

above average

average

below average

| was not covered during your therapy? | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|---------------------------|---------------|--|--|--|--|
| 6. Statement of the supervisor: | | | | | | | |
| I declare that all referenced sources are properly cited or paraphrased in the thesis. The thesis was evaluated by the similarity test (SIS - Turnitin), and the similarity report is attached in the electronic documentation of thesis in SIS. | | | | | | | |
| 7. Recommendation for the defense: | yes | yes with- reservations | no | | | | |
| 8. Proposed classification level: | very good | | | | | | |
| In Prague: 25.6.2021 | sup | ervisor's signatu | ure | | | | |