## **REPORT OF BACHELOR THESIS**

| Leadership's name:   | PhDr. Lenka Satrapová, Ph.D. |                      |                       |                     |  |  |  |
|--|------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|
| Student's name:  | Ioannis Hadjiyiannis         |                      |                       |                     |  |  |  |
| Title of diploma thesis name:  |                              |                      |                       |                     |  |  |  |
| Case Study of Physiotherapy Treatment of a Patient with the Diagnosis Anterior ST-segment elevation myocardial   |                              |                      |                       |                     |  |  |  |
| infraction Goal of thesis:   |                              |                      |                       |                     |  |  |  |
| This thesis involves a case study approach red   | garding to a pat             | ient with Anterio    | or ST-segment e       | elevation           |  |  |  |
| myocardial infraction. Theoretical part describes  | •                            |                      |                       | · ·                 |  |  |  |
| of the heart, arteries, veins and the valves. Inform   |                              |                      |                       |                     |  |  |  |
| practical part I analyze every procedure I have  | e done with m                | y patient, all       | the examination       | s, conclusions,     |  |  |  |
| therapies and results.   |                              |                      |                       |                     |  |  |  |
| 1. Volume:   |                              |                      |                       |                     |  |  |  |
| * pages of text  | 60                           |                      |                       |                     |  |  |  |
| * literature   | 22<br>18 tables, 5 figur     | ros E annondico      | ,                     |                     |  |  |  |
| * tables, graphs, appendices   | 16 tables, 5 figur           | es, 5 appendices     | 5                     |                     |  |  |  |
| 2. Seriousness of topics:  | above average                | average              | under avarage         |                     |  |  |  |
| * theroretical knowledges  |                              | X                    |                       |                     |  |  |  |
| * in a state of the circumstance of the circum |                              |                      |                       |                     |  |  |  |
| * input data and their processing  |                              | X                    |                       |                     |  |  |  |
| * used methods   |                              | Х                    |                       |                     |  |  |  |
|  |                              |                      |                       |                     |  |  |  |
| 3. Criteria of thesis classification   | excellent                    | yory good            | caticfactory          | unsatisfactory      |  |  |  |
| degree of aim of work fulfilment   | X                            | very good            | satisfactory          | unsatisfactory      |  |  |  |
| degree of aim of work familiteit   | A                            |                      | aim of wo             | rk was fulfilled    |  |  |  |
| independence of student during process of thesis   |                              | Х                    |                       |                     |  |  |  |
| logical construction of work   | Х                            |                      |                       |                     |  |  |  |
|  | ed the requirements          | for bachelor's the   | sis, theoretical part | is precisly written |  |  |  |
| work with literature and citations   |                              | Х                    |                       | processy streets    |  |  |  |
|  |                              | relatively           | lower number of       | f literary sources  |  |  |  |
| adequacy of used methods   | X                            |                      |                       |                     |  |  |  |
| design of work (text, graphs, tables)  | Х                            |                      |                       |                     |  |  |  |
| overall a very nice  |                              | ext is clearly divid | ded in theoretical    | and special part    |  |  |  |
| stylistic level  | X                            | At 15 cicarry divic  | ica iii tiicoreticar  | ана эрсскаг рагс    |  |  |  |
|  | work is wi                   | itten in readable    | form without gra      | ammatical errors    |  |  |  |
|  |                              |                      |                       |                     |  |  |  |
| 4. Usefulness of the thesis outcomes:  | under average                | average              | above average         | -                   |  |  |  |
|  |                              |                      |                       |                     |  |  |  |
| 5. Comments and questions to answer:   |                              |                      |                       |                     |  |  |  |
| 1) Would you recommend to your patient some sports activity in future, which will be suitable to her medical state?  |                              |                      |                       |                     |  |  |  |
| 2) How will you lead the long -term therapy, if you will have possibility to work with your patient for longer time?   |                              |                      |                       |                     |  |  |  |
| 3) Do you have any recommendations to her lifestyle?   |                              |                      |                       |                     |  |  |  |
|  |                              |                      |                       |                     |  |  |  |
|  |                              |                      |                       |                     |  |  |  |
| 6. Recomendation for defence:  | yes                          | <del>no</del>        | ]                     |                     |  |  |  |
| 7. Designed classificatory degree excellent  |                              |                      |                       |                     |  |  |  |
| 7. Designed classificatory degree  |                              | cording to defen     | se                    |                     |  |  |  |

| 8.5.2016 |                              |
|----------|------------------------------|
|          | PhDr. Lenka Satrapová, Ph.D. |