REVIEW OF THE BACHELOR’S THESIS
SUPERVISOR

Student’s name: Filip Shrbený

Thesis title: Index of Economic Freedom, case of Czech Republic

Name of the thesis supervisor: Dominik Stroukal

Assessment of the topic itself ( irrespectively of the student):
1.1 To what extent is the topic current and significant? X
1.2 How challenging is the topic in respect of theoretical knowledge? X
1.3 How challenging it in respect of practical experience or fieldwork? X
1.4 How difficult is it to get background materials? X

Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:
Subsection 1.1: The topic itself is rather wide but interesting and significant. The relationship between long term economic growth and economic freedom is well established and a comprehensive study what to do to help the growth through improvements in economic freedom is missing.
Other (as appropriate): The work itself is more theoretical than empirical.

2. Evaluation of the thesis structure and logical cohesion:
2.1 To what extent is the thesis structure logical and transparent? X
2.2 To what extent does the author use current / suitable sources? X
2.3 How properly did the author select methods in respect of the topic? X
2.4 How sufficiently and functionally did the author use in the thesis original charts, tables, data, annexes, etc.? X
2.5 What is the compatibility level for the thesis basic line elements: topic – thesis assignment –objective – structure - conclusions? X

Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:
Subsection 2.1: The logic of the work is straightforward. But reader can be lost in many sections where author does talk about many things together without clear conclusions.
Subsection 2.5: High.
Other (as appropriate): 

3. Assessment of the thesis text quality:
3.1 How well – in terms of depth and quality – did the author analyze the topic? X
3.2 Did the author formulate the thesis objective clearly and with logical structure? X

Instructions for the review: Author of the review must provide verbal assessment for the specified subsections, which are pivotal for the thesis assessment, particularly for the defense; therefore, the assessment must have reasonable explanatory power.
Note: Classification method: 1 = exceptional, 2 = very good, 3 = good, 4 = failed.
3.3 Did the author fulfill the defined thesis objective and approved assignment of the thesis that contains the objective? □ □ X □

3.4 How well – in terms of depth and quality – did the author cover the theoretical part of the thesis? □ X □ □

3.5 How well – in terms of depth and quality – did the author cover the practical / analytical part of the thesis? □ □ X □

3.6 To what extent are the thesis conclusions logically structured and show quality, and what is their added value? □ □ X □

Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:
Subsection 3.2: The objective is clearly stated. However, it is quite wide but answerable.
Subsection 3.3: Author did a lot of work but to fulfill the objective he would have to do much more.
Subsection 3.4: There is much more of theoretical coverage than of empirical work. In this sense the thesis is unbalanced. As a reader I can understand what the indices but do not know much about what to change to have better ranking.
Subsection 3.5: -/-
Subsection 3.6: This is the weakest part of the thesis. There are lot of conclusions but it is hard to follow them.

Other (as appropriate):

4. Assessment of the thesis form and style:
4.1 What is the formal layout of the thesis? □ □ X □

4.2 What is the quality of citations and references? Are sources identifiable? □ □ □ □

4.3 What is the stylistic level of the thesis, particularly the use of correct economic terminology? □ □ X □

Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:
Subsection 4.2: The sources are clearly identifiable. There are dozens of online sources but author uses them where it makes sense.
Other (as appropriate): Author uses plenty of non-academic terms and overall it is written more as a journalist’s blog post than a rigorous paper. For a bachelor thesis it is sufficient but I would recommend to read and write more to improve the style.

At some points (Methodology) author did unnecessarily blindly follow the required structure even though he said nothing in there.

5. Overall assessment (It is necessary to state, whether the thesis meets the requirements of the Methodology of the Faculty of Economics in terms of the quality of contents, scope and formal requirements, whether the thesis is/is not recommended for defense. It may also be nominated for a special award, etc.):
Overall, the work is not bad, but has plenty of space for improvement. Author clearly did a lot of work but struggles with clear answering his own questions. I recommend the thesis for defense as good with a possibility for a better grade if author would be able to clearly present his conclusions

6. Questions and remarks to the defense:

Instructions for the review: Author of the review must provide verbal assessment for the specified subsections, which are pivotal for the thesis assessment, particularly for the defense; therefore, the assessment must have reasonable explanatory power.
Note: Classification method: 1 = exceptional, 2 = very good, 3 = good, 4 = failed.
I have just one question – can you clearly in one sentence state the conclusion of the thesis? What is the main finding and recommendation you have from your work?

**Proposed grade: Good.**

Date: 25. 1. 2017

Signature of the Thesis Supervisor

---
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