

Opponent's Report on Dissertation Thesis

Institute of Economic Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University
Opletalova 26, 110 00 Praha 1, Czech Republic
Phone: +420 222 112 330, Fax: +420 222 112 304

Author:	Vědunka Kopečná
Advisor:	PhDr. Jaromír Baxa Ph.D. (IES)
Title of the Thesis:	Four essays on Policy Evaluation and Analysis
Type of Defense:	DEFENSE
Date of Pre-Defense	June 2, 2021
Opponent:	Prof. Karl Steininger PhD (University of Graz)

Address the following questions in your report, please:

- a) Can you recognize an original contribution of the author?
- b) Is the thesis based on relevant references?
- c) Is the thesis defensible at your home institution or another respected institution where you gave lectures?
- d) Do the results of the thesis allow their publication in a respected economic journal?
- e) Are there any additional major comments on what should be improved?
- f) What is your overall assessment of the thesis? (a) I recommend the thesis for defense without substantial changes, (b) the thesis can be defended after revision indicated in my comments, (c) not-defensible in this form.

(Note: The report should be at least 2 pages long.)

(a) On the original contribution of the author: Chapter 1 (General Introduction) supplies an overview of the overall thesis issue of economic policy analysis, distinguishing the two approaches *ex ante* and *ex post*, and discusses the research questions addressed in each of the papers and the methodological approach chosen respectively. It thus supplies the link among the three papers to a broader set of diverse approaches analyzing public policies. It thereby demonstrates the broad methodological capacities of the author, which she applied in each field, in two cases in collaboration with her co-authors.

For Chapter 2 the contribution of the dissertation author relative to both a senior co-author and other authors is now (different to the pre-defense version) also well specified (Chapter 1, p. 3).

For Chapter 3 the contribution of the dissertation author (in Chapter 1) is clearly specified, and made explicit that her co-author co-guided the work, but that data set compilation, actual estimations and first paper draft were accomplished by the dissertation author.

Chapter 4, a single-authored contribution, is an evident own contribution of the dissertation author.

For all chapters (2 to 4) the original contribution of the papers to the literature is clearly evident.

(b) Is the thesis based on relevant references?

Chapters 2 and 3 had already in the pre-defense version been clearly well embedded into the literature with references comprehensively present. The suggestion of extension in that respect for chapter 1 has been taken up. For chapter 4 there is only limited literature on the particular topic, and the paper is methodologically well embedded.

(c) Defensibility at my home institution:

After suggestions as given in the pre-defense by referees have been taken up, a clear yes. In particular, in Chapter 3 WIOD (price) data has now been used switching to a specification in EUROS, with the results re-estimated, as the analysis is on the European region, now preventing any real exchange rate fluctuation (between USD and EURO) to unfavorably impact elasticity results.

On both accounts relevant for defensibility, (i) own contribution to developing the field further and respective research results and (ii) comprehensiveness, the criteria are met against the standards of both my home institution and other institutions I have contributed evaluations to.

(d) Do the results of the thesis allow their publication in a respected economic journal?

Both chapters 2 and 4 have been published already, for chapter 3 the one remaining issue has been resolved in the way indicated in section (c) above, so also this chapter does fulfill the criterion now.

(e) Are there any additional major comments on what should be improved?

Beyond the major issue of improvement that has been carried out and is mentioned above (chapter 3 re-estimations), also the other suggestions for improvement submitted with the pre-defense evaluation have been taken up, such as an improved presentation in Chapter 3 (with new tables 3.4-3.7). In Chapter 3 also the results and conclusions are now elaborated and explained in more detail, easing the readers understanding.

Regarding one discussion we had on a sensitivity of model results in a paper already published (now chapter 2): this is just a background discussion, relevant for future work, to be put towards sensitivity analysis (“doesn’t that depend on model closure?” and “doesn’t this depend on what the tax revenues are used for?”). The response to review here in the first case touches on a different issue. Also, the macroeconomic model closure (whether new investments crowd out other demand or are additional also in real terms), will impact these results. On the second issue, the answer points to the correct issue, yet, still a sensitivity analysis with respect to revenue use options carried out in future research might result in different directions the macroeconomic indicators develop to. These would be two further points, in addition to those already foreseen by the dissertation author, to be considered for her updates of model and future papers.

(f) What is your overall assessment of the thesis? (a) I recommend the thesis for defense without substantial changes, (b) the thesis can be defended after revision indicated in my comments, (c) not-defendable in this form.

Given the revisions as indicated in sections (c) and (d) above have been carried out successfully, I recommend the thesis for defense without substantial changes.

Date:	February 1 st , 2022
Opponent's Signature:	
Opponent's Affiliation:	Prof. Mag. Dr. Karl Steininger (University of Graz)