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:	**Jindřich Matoušek**
Advisor:	Prof. PhDr. Tomáš Havránek Ph.D. (IES)
Title of the Thesis:	Essays in Behavioural and Experimental Economics
Type of Defense:	**DEFENSE**
Date of Pre-Defense	April 6, 2022
Opponent:	Ing. Tomáš Miklánek M.A. Ph.D. (VŠE)

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 defendable 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-defendable in this form.

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

The final version of dissertation thesis "Essays in Behavioural and Experimental Economics" by Jindřich Matoušek is very similar to the previous version, and it reacts mostly to the comments made by his supervisor and three referees. These modifications do not change the aim, results, or overall structure of the thesis. They only lead to improvements in quality of the thesis which has been already at the very high level in the pre-defence stage.

Therefore, I will focus my report only on these changes and I see no point in extensively repeating what has been previously written. The thesis still a) contains original contribution of the author, b) is based on relevant references, c) is defendable at any reputable institution, d) allows for publication of its chapter in respected economic journals (which already happened for two out of three main chapters).

My comments were mostly only of minor importance, and I appreciate Jindřich's confident replies. My first two comments were about the already published Chapter 2 paper (Collusion in Multi-Object Auctions: Experimental Evidence) and there was no need to incorporate the replies into the main body of the thesis.

My last comment was very similar to what other two referees pointed out. Jindřich admits that comparison of economic and psychological literature would bring additional value, but this goes beyond the aim of this work. It is true that the expectations of the two fields might differ, but it is not clear from the answer how this would be translated into different effects of incentives on motivation. For example, would it work explicitly through different methodology which is biased towards finding certain results or would each field implicitly create different experimenter demand effect? I believe this should be further clarified for the published version of this paper, but it is not necessary to be again rewritten for the purpose of the thesis defense.

I also went through Jindřich's replies to other two referees. I consider them to be competent and satisfactory to the extent that they pose no obstacle for this thesis to be successfully defended.

I do not have any additional comments at this point, and I recommend the thesis for defense without substantial changes

Date:	
Opponent's Signature:	
Opponent's Affiliation:	Ing. Tomas Mikianek M.A. Ph.D. (VŠE)