

# UNIVERZITA KARLOVA

Fakulta sociálních věd

## Záznam o průběhu obhajoby disertační práce

Akademický rok: 2020/2021

**Jméno a příjmení studenta:** Mgr. Petr Polák, M.Sc.  
**Rok narození:** 1988  
**Identifikační číslo studenta:** 64212974

**Typ studijního programu:** doktorský  
**Studijní program:** Ekonomie a finance  
**Studijní obor:** Ekonomie a finance  
**Identifikační čísla studia:** 425891

**Název práce:** Essays in Applied Meta-Analysis  
**Pracoviště práce:** Institut ekonomických studií (23-IES)  
**Jazyk práce:** angličtina  
**Jazyk obhajoby:** čeština  
**Školitel:** doc. PhDr. Tomáš Havránek, Ph.D.  
**Oponent(i):** prof. Geoff Pugh, M.Sc.  
PhDr. Marek Rusnák, Ph.D.  
prof. William Robert Reed

**Datum obhajoby:** 02.12.2020      **Místo obhajoby:** Praha  
**Hlasování komise:** prospěl/a: 5      neprospěl/a: 0

**Průběh obhajoby:** The Defense Committee Chair welcomed present committee members and all participants that and joined the defense online in Microsoft Teams.  
The Defense Committee Chair initiated the defense by verbal statements confirming (i) that a satisfactory number of Defense Committee Members were present, (ii) that the student fulfilled all the requirements as listed in the Study and Examination Code of Charles University.

The Defense Committee Chair introduced all committee members and asked Petr Polák to present his dissertation thesis. Petr Polák shortly described the main findings of the dissertation. Afterwards, Petr Polák focused on the 3-rd chapter called "The Euro's Trade Effect: A Meta Analysis" in more detail.  
After reading the referees' (appointed by the Graduation Council) comments, an open discussion followed. During the discussion, Petr Polák satisfactorily answered all the questions from the audience. During the Defense Committee voting, Petr Polák left the room, the audience left the online room, and then committee members voted. The Defense Committee members that were present online will confirm this record in the form of per rollam voting within the next two days.

Question: What is the status of these methods? What are the opinions of people on meta-analysis - guidelines

Answer: Explained the current guidelines changes and how it motivates the proper reporting of the results. Mentions the importance of dealing with the endogeneity.  
The committee members were satisfied with the answer.

Question: The issue of rounding numbers - if your p-value is below a certain value - the authors may not report the actual values. How is it affecting the results?

Answer: We can directly collect from the results. Sometimes it can be calculated from the provided data. In some studies, it may be a problem but overall it should not affect our work with large number of analyzed works.

The committee members were satisfied with the answer.

Question: Slide 8: summary of the motivation. There has been a huge u-shape in the effect. Could you do a meta-analysis of meta-analysis?

Answer: I can be done. To see what the researchers are doing, investigating the statistical significance of them. More transparency.  
The committee members were satisfied with the answer.

Question: Huge variation in variation in reported results. Would it be reasonable to exclude some values as they are extreme?

Answer: All are reported as we do not know.

The committee members were satisfied with the answer.

Question: How far is the meta-analysis from the bootstrap.

Answer: Meta-analysis focus is now more on this topic.

The committee members were satisfied with the answer.

**Výsledek obhajoby:**

prospěl/a (P)

**Předseda komise:**

doc. PhDr. Martin Gregor, Ph.D. (přítomen) .....

**Členové komise:**

PhDr. Michal Hlaváček, Ph.D. (přítomen) .....

prof. PhDr. Ladislav Krištofuk, Ph.D. (přítomen) .....

doc. PhDr. Jozef Baruník, Ph.D. (přítomen) .....

prof. Geoff Pugh, M.Sc. (přítomen) .....

PhDr. Marek Rusnák, Ph.D. ....

prof. William Robert Reed .....