

## I. IDENTIFICATION DATA

<b>Thesis title:</b>	The Historical Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina: Preservation of a Modernist Gem in Sarajevo
<b>Author's name:</b>	Bc. Verda Mesihović
<b>Type of thesis :</b>	master
<b>Faculty/Institute:</b>	Faculty of Architecture (FA)
<b>Department:</b>	Department of Architectural Conservation
<b>Thesis reviewer:</b>	Assoc. Prof. PhDr. Martin Horáček, Ph.D.
<b>Reviewer's department:</b>	Brno University of Technology, Faculty of Architecture

## II. EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA

<b>Assignment</b>	<b>challenging</b>
<i>How demanding was the assigned project?</i>	
Please insert your comments here.	

<b>Fulfilment of assignment</b>	<b>fulfilled with major objections</b>
<i>How well does the thesis fulfil the assigned task? Have the primary goals been achieved? Which assigned tasks have been incompletely covered, and which parts of the thesis are overextended? Justify your answer.</i>	
Please insert your comments here.	

<b>Methodology</b>	<b>correct</b>
<i>Comment on the correctness of the approach and/or the solution methods.</i>	
Please insert your comments here.	

<b>Technical level</b>	<b>C - good.</b>
<i>Is the thesis technically sound? How well did the student employ expertise in the field of his/her field of study? Does the student explain clearly what he/she has done?</i>	
Please insert your comments here.	

<b>Formal and language level, scope of thesis</b>	<b>D - satisfactory.</b>
<i>Are formalisms and notations used properly? Is the thesis organized in a logical way? Is the thesis sufficiently extensive? Is the thesis well-presented? Is the language clear and understandable? Is the English satisfactory?</i>	
Please insert your comments here.	

<b>Selection of sources, citation correctness</b>	<b>C - good.</b>
<i>Does the thesis make adequate reference to earlier work on the topic? Was the selection of sources adequate? Is the student's original work clearly distinguished from earlier work in the field? Do the bibliographic citations meet the standards?</i>	
Please insert your comments here.	

<b>Additional commentary and evaluation (optional)</b>
<i>Comment on the overall quality of the thesis, its novelty and its impact on the field, its strengths and weaknesses, the utility of the solution that is presented, the theoretical/formal level, the student's skillfulness, etc.</i>
Please insert your comments here.

### III. OVERALL EVALUATION, QUESTIONS FOR THE PRESENTATION AND DEFENSE OF THE THESIS, SUGGESTED GRADE

#### Subject:

The topic of the thesis is a proposal for the revitalization of the building of the Historical Museum in Sarajevo, a cultural monument representing the architecture of post-war modernism in Bosnia and Herzegovina (built in 1963, protected since 2012). The building currently has insufficient capacity and some parts are dilapidated. The proposed building programme envisages the establishment of a conference and cultural centre with an auditorium, an extension of the depository and operational facilities.

#### Evaluation:

This is the second time that the graduate has submitted her thesis for defence; therefore, a comparison with the previous version can be used for evaluation.

The author has added items in the bibliographic list and has inserted references to sources directly into the text, as befits a professional text. However, the other changes have not led to an improvement, rather the opposite. The author has shortened the historical commentary, which was excellent in the previous version and helped the foreign reader to orient himself in the issues of the history of architecture in Bosnia and Herzegovina and, namely, in the story of the museum building. The current text is less clear in terms of content (cf. p. 22). The practical SWOT analysis of the state of the building has disappeared. The verbal description of the building is shorter. The author has replaced the referential buildings with others, but the description of their renovation is superficial and unrelated to the author's project. The acknowledgements are also lost. In turn, the newly added double-page section (pp. 72-73) with photographs of outdoor events is redundant. The end of a sentence is missing at the bottom of page 26.

In my previous review, I criticized the insufficient scope of the author's report, lacking the explanation of the modifications. Nothing has improved in this regard. While readers can understand from the attached, graphically impressive floor plans and renderings what changes are being made, they will not learn how these changes are functionally justified. The number of proposed depositories is smaller than previously, but it is still unclear whether they are appropriate to the nature and size of the objects the museum holds. The term 'preservation' appears in the title of the work, but no specific conservation/preservation/restoration methods and procedures are mentioned in detail in the author's proposal. On the contrary, it seems that the author wants to completely replace all the glass surfaces of the facades - with replicas? Still missing is a description of the technical solution for connecting the original building with the newly designed extension, as well as a justification of the chosen stylistic (artistic) vocabulary for the new elements. Nowadays, it should also be a matter of course to consider the environmental impact of all steps in the eventual implementation of the project, aspects of material recycling, energy sustainability of the premises, etc.

The grade that I award for the thesis is **D - satisfactory**.



Date: **21.1.2025**

Signature: Martin Horáček