

Opponents' Assessment of the Bachelor Thesis

Title: Case study: Physiotherapy treatment of a patient with sacral, lumbar and lower thoracic lumbago

Autor: Lars NAES

Opponent: Doc. Dr. Dagmar Pavlů, CSc.

The bachelor thesis titled the “*Case Study: Physiotherapeutic treatment of a patient with sacral, lumbar and lower thoracic lumbago*” is written on 58 pages, supplemented with six pages of annexes, using 23 bibliographic sources.

The main goal of this thesis is to summarize theoretical background of the diagnosis „lumbago“ and then present one case study of a patient, which student treated during clinical placement in Monada clinic.

The paper is structured as a standard bachelor thesis with five chapters. The theoretical part (chapter 2) includes description of anatomy and kinesiology, biomechanics of the lumbar vertebral column and sacrum, and etiology and epidemiology of lumbago. Attention was paid also to treatment and prognosis. This part of the thesis, form and content, is written satisfactory.

In special part case study is presented. This includes initial kinesiological examination, therapy course, final kinesiological examination and evaluation of therapy effectiveness. This part of the thesis is written satisfactory, however excessive brevity is evident. To described procedures - I have no essential objections.

Paper was drafted in english, graphic standard of whole the work is average.

Comments:

I have a few minor comments and one questions for the defence:

- abstract is write up no quite systematically (future tense – thesis aim, past tense in methods and result),
- title of thesis on front page and title of thesis in abstract are different,
- signature in declaration is missing,
- Fig. 1 – Fig. 10: citation of source is missing,
- p. 33 and p. 50: ROM examination: degrees are missing,

- p. 35 and p. 53: print mistake “Laesic” (correct = Lasegue),
- p. 53. print mistake “Trendlenburg”) correct = Trendelenburg),
- **Question for the defence**: Talk about the DNS procedures which have you used.
- **Question for the defence**: Explain the difference / identity of terms “rehabilitation” and “physiotherapy”.

Conclusion:

Despite the objections stated above, I note that the writer of the bachelor thesis demonstrated capability of dealing with the issue at hand. The submitted paper complies with the requirements applicable on a standard basis to bachelor thesis on the Charles University in Prague – FTVS, and therefore **I recommend the paper of Lars Naess to be admitted for defence.** I propose a mark of very good.

Prague, 13 of May 2014

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