

Name of the student:	Aleksander Gustaw Jaworski
Title of the thesis:	Comparison of suicides trends in Poland and Czech Republic with alcohol abuse and depression as chosen risk factors in the context of preventive policies
Reviewer:	Karel Svoboda

1. KNOWLEDGE AND CONNECTION TO THE FIELD

(relevance of the research question, research objective, literature review):

Comparing Poland and the Czech Republic in terms of their suicidal rates caused by alcohol and depression is logical and appropriate. However, the need should be better explained in the introduction. The introduction itself is very limited, leaving the explanation of the methodology, research question and objective untold. We can find parts of methodology in the body of the thesis, but it should be placed at the beginning. Also, the structure of the thesis should be explained – what are the roles of each of the chapters? On top of that, the research question is not clear. It is not stated, therefore it is hard for me to understand what the thesis should say. This is probably the biggest problem of the thesis – undefined research question.

2. ANALYSIS

(methodology, argument, theoretical backing, appropriate work with sources):

The methodology itself is unclear to me, I must admit. The thesis deals extensively with general trends in suicide caused by alcohol and depression, but also describes the situation in Poland and the Czech Republic, aims at describing the programs dealing with the topic of suicide etc. As a result, the strength of the argument is broken into several topics. On the contrary, I must admire an extensive collection of sources, often from medical sphere.

3. CONCLUSIONS

(persuasiveness, link between data and conclusions, achievement of research objectives):

Once again, the problem is that the thesis lacks one clear research question, where the method of analysis would address the question etc. The conclusion therefore speaks about some general global trends, about the situation in both the countries, about the programs. It could be better, if there was one key question (for instance, how the countries address this topic).

4. FORMAL ASPECTS AND LANGUAGE

(appropriate language, adherence to academic standards, citation style, layout):

The language is appropriate (which does not mean that proofreading would be unnecessary), although a lot of typos can be found. The author should also limit the use of “what is interesting” etc. Other issues that somehow indicate that the author finished the paper in a haste – page numbers are missing, bibliography is not edited uniformly (some titles written in capital letters, some in lower, spaces between the records etc. None of these is a disaster but would deserve some time to address. Also the layout could be improved – the table of contents is composed of heads of the chapters without being put into a real table and indicating page numbers (which are missing in the whole document anyway).

5. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT

(strong and weak point of the dissertation, other issues)

In general, the thesis is very interesting, with an enormous data collected on the topic. However, it suffers from some weaknesses. First and foremost, the thesis is descriptive rather than analytical, presenting details about situation in both countries. However, it is not clear, in what way it is comparing them and what is the purpose of this comparison.

The paper could and should be more focused on the topic itself. My biggest remark goes to the structure of the paper. It contains a vast overview of the literature on depression and alcohol consumption, which is rather too extensive and general. As a result, the conclusions are not very persuasive, although the author put an enormous work into this thesis. I see a huge potential in the thesis, however, it rests only a halfway through. If I can suggest, narrowing and cutting off

unnecessary parts would help the thesis a lot.

Grade (A-F):	D
Date:	Signature:
20 September 2022	

classification scheme

Percentile	Prague		Krakow		Leiden		Barcelona	
	Range	%	Score	%	Range	%	Range	%
A (91-100)	91-100 %	8,5%	5	6,7%	8,5-10	5,3%	9-10	5,5 %
B (81-90)	81-90 %	16,3%	4,5	11,7%	7,5-8,4	16,4%	8-8,9	11,0 %
C (71-80)	71-80 %	16,3%	4	20%	6,5-7,4	36,2%	7-7,9	18,4 %
D (61-70)	61-70 %	24%	3,5	28,3%			6-6,9	35,2 %
E (51-60)	51-60 %	34,9%	3	33,4 %	6-6,4	42,1 %	5-5,9	30,1 %

Assessment criteria:

Excellent (A): ‘Outstanding performance with only minor errors’;

Very good (B): ‘Above the average standard but with some errors’;

Good (C): ‘Generally sound work but with a number of notable errors’;

Satisfactory (D): ‘Fair but with significant shortcomings’;

Sufficient (E): ‘Performance meets the minimum criteria’;

Fail: ‘Some/considerable more work required before the credit can be awarded’.