

Report on Master Thesis

Institute of Economic Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Student:	Barbora Hrušková
Advisor:	PhDr. Jana Votápková Ph.D
Title of the thesis:	Diet after retirement: Does working after retirement matter?

OVERALL ASSESSMENT (provided in English, Czech, or Slovak):

Please provide a short summary of the thesis, your assessment of each of the four key categories, and an overall evaluation and suggested questions for the discussion. The minimum length of the report is 300 words.

Short summary

Based on SHARE data, the thesis investigate if and how the diet of retirees changes when they go back to work after a period of retirement. The empirical analysis applies a propensity score matching approach testing it to several robustness checks and comparing it also with a logit model. If the author finds no significant differences in the consumption of dairy products, legumes and eggs, retirees who get back to work result to be more likely to eat meat, fruits and vegetables. However, working retirees are less likely to consume meat every day than those who do not work.

Contribution

The thesis develops a very specific and narrow question as the effect of working after retirement on the diet of retirees. This question has been substantially disregarded by related literature and, in this perspective, the present thesis helps to fill a gap. The student does a nice job in defining the research question, dealing with the empirical analysis and trying to critically discuss the observed results.

Methods

The student performed a careful analysis considering different model specifications and testing their validity proving a good methodological knowledge in addressing the proposed research question. I also appreciated the dicussion of the limitations of the work done.

Literature

The relevant literature is cited properly and the student proved to have a good knowledge of the related literature. In particular, the literature review is well structured and covers all the relevant aspects connected to the research question.

Manuscript form

The thesis is well organized. Overall, the language is appropriate and the text is clear. Tables are presented correctly and always combined with explanatory notes. Bibliography and citations are adequate.

Overall evaluation and suggested questions for the discussion during the defense

I believe the present thesis fulfills the formal requirements for a master thesis at IES, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University. The student formulated a clear research question, proved to be familiar with the existing works on the topic and performed a quite careful empirical analysis contributing to the understanding of the consequences of getting back to work after retirement on eating habits of

Report on Master Thesis

Institute of Economic Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Student:	Barbora Hrušková
Advisor:	PhDr. Jana Votápková Ph.D
Title of the thesis:	Diet after retirement: Does working after retirement matter?

retirees. Overall, the work is well written and presented. The results of the Urkud analysis did not raise any concerns. For all these reasons, I believe the thesis is ready for defence and I recommend it for the defence suggesting a grade A.

Suggested questions:

- *Could you better argument how the characteristics of the working status could explain the heterogeneous result found with respect to the number of working hours per week on the daily intake of meat?*
- *The thesis uses SHARE data. Specifically, the data are taken from wave 7 and 8 and this means working with 2017 and 2019-2020 data. Can have the COVID affected somehow the results? Should not have been this phenomenon taken into account?*

SUMMARY OF POINTS AWARDED (for details, see below):

CATEGORY	POINTS
<i>Contribution (max. 30 points)</i>	26
<i>Methods (max. 30 points)</i>	28
<i>Literature (max. 20 points)</i>	20
<i>Manuscript Form (max. 20 points)</i>	18
TOTAL POINTS (max. 100 points)	92
GRADE (A – B – C – D – E – F)	A

NAME OF THE REFEREE: *Paola Bertoli*

DATE OF EVALUATION: 22.01.2023

Digitally signed (23.01.2023):
Paola Bertoli

Referee Signature

