

# 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:	<b>Petr Pleticha</b>
Advisor:	Ing. Martin Srholec Ph.D. (CERGE-EI)
Title of the Thesis:	Essays on the Impact of Technological Change on Economic Structure
Type of Defense:	<b>DEFENSE</b>
Date of Pre-Defense	December 14, 2022
Opponent:	Dr. Micheline Goedhuys (United Nations University in Maastricht)

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.)*

---

I have taken a careful look at my comments to the previous version, and the way they were addressed by the doctoral candidate.

I noticed a great improvement in the introductory chapter, where the author discusses in much more detail the theoretical framework linking the chapters of the dissertation and providing the background to his study. I think this has improved a lot.

In the second chapter, I had a minor issue on the definition of rent spillovers. This is clarified in the text and it helps to understand the discussion of table 2.2 col 4. The author also elaborates on the industry specificity of the threshold level of R&D returns.

In chapter three, though the hypotheses have been removed, not much has been changed to the text leading to the hypotheses. Hence, this was a bit a misinterpretation of my comment. I was not opposed to explicit hypotheses but I suggested a clearer introduction to the hypotheses or alternatively an open research question on the impact heterogeneity. These are more comments of an editorial nature and are not crucial for the evaluation of the thesis.

The points I raised in chapter four are well addressed.

Overall, I notice that the revision has led to an improvement of the dissertation. I can reiterate what I wrote in the previous report, that the thesis is of good quality and can be defended without additional changes.

Date: Opponent's Signature:	
Opponent's Affiliation:	Dr. Micheline Goedhuys (United Nations University in Maastricht)