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Comments, explaining strengths and weaknesses (**at least 300 words**):

**Suggested mark: 70**

**Best aspects of the dissertation**
This very interesting dissertation adds value to the literature by combining different methodological perspectives to analyse the effectiveness of Russian food ban. The analysis is coherent, precise and detailed throughout. The writing and structure are very clear. The presentation is excellent. Very good understanding of the question of economic sanctions and the related literature, from different fields of study.

**Suggestions for improvement**
It would have been good to define the methodological framework more clearly and explicitly, by explaining to the reader exactly which methodologies the work is combining, and which elements it is using from each of those. A closely related point is that it would be good to explain more explicitly which fields of literature are being used in this interdisciplinary work. It would also be good to offer more background on the public choice literature in general, and to explain how Kaempfer and Lowenberg (1988) fit within it. The writing could be more formal, and it would be good to avoid personal/subjective expressions.

Specific questions you would like addressing at the oral defence (**at least 2 questions**):

How would you say that your dissertation adds value to the existing literature?

Your dissertation combines several different methodologies – could you name and explain two of them?