

# Report on Bachelor / Master Thesis

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

<b>Student:</b>	<b>Ecaterina Locoman</b>
<b>Advisor:</b>	<b>Doc. Tomáš Holub</b>
<b>Title of the thesis:</b>	<b>Central Bank Communication: Comparison between the Czech National Bank and the National Bank of Moldova</b>

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

The thesis focuses on the comparison of monetary policy transparency in the Czech Republic and Moldova. It contains very useful literature survey. The thesis is well-written. It is thoughtful and original piece of work. The author demonstrates good understanding of various aspects related to the analysis of monetary policy transparency. The analysis and comparison of central banks in the Czech Republic and Moldova is very detailed and accurate.

Surely, one could raise several minor comments such as that some important papers are missing in the literature, or that the thesis somewhat surprisingly lacks at least the discussion about why some central banks are more transparent than others. Nevertheless, I have to say that I consider these points as minor and I am impressed by the thoughtful argumentation and accurate description of policy making in these two central banks.

All in all, I strongly recommend the thesis for the defense and suggest grade A.

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

# Report on Bachelor / Master Thesis

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

<b>Student:</b>	<b>Ecaterina Locoman</b>
<b>Advisor:</b>	<b>Doc. Tomáš Holub</b>
<b>Title of the thesis:</b>	<b>Central Bank Communication: Comparison between the Czech National Bank and the National Bank of Moldova</b>

<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
<i>Literature</i> (max. 20 points)	18
<i>Methods</i> (max. 30 points)	25
<i>Contribution</i> (max. 30 points)	25
<i>Manuscript Form</i> (max. 20 points)	20
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b> (max. 100 points)	<b>88</b>
<b>GRADE</b> (1 – 2 – 3 – 4)	<b>1</b>

**NAME OF THE REFEREE:**

**DATE OF EVALUATION:**

---

**Referee Signature**

**EXPLANATION OF CATEGORIES AND SCALE:**

**LITERATURE REVIEW:** *The thesis demonstrates author's full understanding and command of recent literature. The author quotes relevant literature in a proper way.*

Strong                  Average                  Weak  
20                          10                          0

**METHODS:** *The tools used are relevant to the research question being investigated, and adequate to the author's level of studies. The thesis topic is comprehensively analyzed.*

Strong                  Average                  Weak  
30                          15                          0

**CONTRIBUTION:** *The author presents original ideas on the topic demonstrating critical thinking and ability to draw conclusions based on the knowledge of relevant theory and empirics. There is a distinct value added of the thesis.*

Strong                  Average                  Weak  
30                          15                          0

**MANUSCRIPT FORM:** *The thesis is well structured. The student uses appropriate language and style, including academic format for graphs and tables. The text effectively refers to graphs and tables and disposes with a complete bibliography.*

Strong                  Average                  Weak  
20                          10                          0

**Overall grading:**

TOTAL POINTS	GRADE		
81 – 100	<b>1</b>	= excellent	= výborně
61 – 80	<b>2</b>	= good	= velmi dobře
41 – 60	<b>3</b>	= satisfactory	= dobře
0 – 40	<b>4</b>	= fail	= nedoporučuji k obhajobě