

Supervisor's Assessment of the Master Thesis

Autor: Iakovos Diogenous
Supervisor: Doc. Dr. Dagmar Pavlů, CSc.
Opponent: Doc. MUDr. František Věle, CSc.
Title: Lumbar Disc Herniation Conservative versus Non-conservative Treatment

The master thesis titled the “*Lumbar Disc Herniation Conservative versus Non-conservative Treatment*” is written on 126 pages, supplemented with two pages of annexes, using 80 bibliographic sources. The paper appears to be interesting and useful.

Topicality

The theme of the thesis chosen by the writer is clearly very topical and deserves to be resolved. The goal of the thesis is “to create a general review to describe methods, results and conclusion of treatment for lumbar disc herniation., to compare conservative with non conservative treatment by meaning of using systematic reviews literature and clinical trials”.

Structure of the paper

The paper is rather voluminous, structured as a standard master thesis with eight chapters. The structure is acceptable for a thesis paper dealing with this particular topic.

Language and graphic standard

It should be noted that the (English) language in which the paper was drafted is not the writer's native language, which is rather apparent. There are also many typing errors and failures in formulation.

Formulation of the objectives and intents of the paper

The formulation of the rather extensive objectives of the paper evidences the immense interest of the writer in the issues in question, and also the dedicated efforts and enthusiasm to solve the not very satisfactory situation in the area of “physical therapy” – the treatment of the patients with disc herniation. The formulation of aim and of goals is acceptable.

Material; methods used

The basic research method used was a systematic review of the relevant literature. According inclusion and exclusion criteria the writer assessed full

papers, reports and meeting abstracts. In the context of the objectives of the paper, the methods used can be considered as adequate.

Processing the findings; interpretation; discussion; conclusions

The processed findings constitute a relatively substantial part of the paper – in terms of its extent. The writer meticulously describes each piece of data or rather findings from literature.

The chapter “Results” summarizes on 6 pages the most important findings of the review. In the discussion the writer confronts the findings of the review with other writers and present also own opinion.

The final chapter of the paper “conclusion” I find write up to briefly.

Comments:

I find the submitted dissertation master thesis to be well-drafted but, I have a few minor comments:

- the abstract must be put in the thesis also in Czech language, it is necessary to load this abstract (in Czech) in the SIS.,
- there are a lot of mistakes in the references (including title – “refernces”) – the bibliography contains a number of incorrect references, and citations of bibliographic sources is inconsistent: It is necessary to load this chapter in the SIS like errata.

Questions for the defence

Describe the situation with treatment – patients with lumbar disc herniation – in your country?

Conclusion:

Despite the objections stated above, I note that the writer of the master thesis demonstrated capability of dealing with the issue at hand. The submitted paper complies with the requirements applicable on a standard basis to master thesis in this field of research, and therefore **I recommend the paper to be admitted for defence.**

Prague, 23 of September 2011

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Dagmar Pavlů, CSc.
Dep. of Physiotherapy UK FTVS