

**Evaluation of bachelor thesis (reviewer's form)**

Author of the thesis: Lenka Novotná

Title of the thesis: Mechanisms coordinating auxin metabolism and transport

**A. Evaluation of individual aspects of the thesis (mark one of the options)**

	<b>1. The character of the thesis (BT) and its structure</b>
X	A - proportionate, corresponds to the scope of BT and to the significance of individual parts
	B - unbalanced, the structure is not logical or the extent of individual parts does not correspond to their importance
	C - satisfactory, the extent of some parts is insufficient
	N - insufficient

	<b>2. Scientific correctness</b>
X	A - excellent, no serious comments
	B - very good, with minor imperfections (ambiguity of interpretation, errors in formulas or chemical nomenclature, incomplete description of methods or results)
	C - satisfactory, with numerous minor defects
	N - unsatisfactory, with serious mistakes

	<b>3. Correctness of the literature resources survey</b>
X	A - without objections, all literary resources properly cited, the total number of resources corresponds to the scope of the BT
	B - satisfactory, with occasional nuisances, especially in the reference placement, or with a lower total number of citations
	C - with more serious mistakes, such as "non-standard" references to textbooks, lectures, web pages, or the sporadic omission of a link to the downloaded data source
	N - unsatisfactory, very few references, or with possible features of plagiarism, references to the source data frequently neglected

	<b>4. Language standard</b>
	A - excellent, the work is well-written and comprehensible, without grammatical / spelling mistakes
X	B - very good, unique stylistic awkwardness, grammatical / spelling mistakes
	C - sufficient, more frequent stylistic awkwardness, frequent grammatical / spelling mistakes, rare sentences difficult to understand or ambiguous formulations
	N - unsatisfactory, frequent serious mistakes

	<b>5. Formal and graphical level of the thesis</b>
X	A - excellent, without spelling mistakes / text formatting errors
	B - very good, unique mistakes in reference format, misspellings, missing abbreviation, etc.
	C - satisfactory, with unique considerable mistake (such as text page skip) or multiple minor bugs
	N - unsatisfactory, frequent serious mistakes

Optional word comment (to points 1. - 5.):

Overall a well written manuscript, well referenced with an appropriate structure. A few grammatical errors and spelling here and there but nothing serious.

### B. The defense

#### *Reviewer's questions for the student (mandatory part of the report!)*

In the introduction "The low auxin levels typically promote growth, while high auxin levels inhibit growth". Is there no difference between root and shoot?

What do you mean by "The conversion of IBA to IAA is pertinent for plant development"?

In the first sentence of the Auxin efflux paragraph, you wrote that IAA is trapped in the intracellular space because the intracellular space is more acidic. Are you sure that the intercellular space is not more acidic than the cytoplasm?

At the end of paragraph 2.1 you wrote that for short periods of time, IAA conjugation is higher. Is it following any kind of cycle? e.g. circadian cycle?

In the beginning of 3.2: Why does the root lose its ability to grow if it's not maintaining the root meristem?

Opinion on the correction(s) of errors:

Errata / correction in the text **IS / IS NOT** (strike out or delete what does not apply) the requirement for the thesis acceptance.

### C. Overall assessment

I recommend the thesis to be accepted for further proceedings: **YES** / **NO**

Reviewer's final classification proposal:  
**1** - excellent; 2 - very good; 3 - good; 4 - unsatisfactory/failed)

Date: 21/05/2021

Name and surname, signature of the reviewer (according to SIS):

Nelson Serte

