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

The thesis of Felix Dent aims to evaluate a food subsidy program, DICONSA, in rural Mexico, especially with respect to improving the nutrition levels in low-income households. The motivation and literature review in the introduction are excellent as is the manuscript form.

Felix Dent employs appropriate econometric methods (propensity score and OLS) to analyse household survey data from Mexico’s La Encuesta Nacional de Ingresos y Gastos de los Hogares (ENIGH). Felix Dent in his thesis answers a number of interesting questions, the main hypothesis being tested is that the establishment of subsidised Diconsa food outlets in targeted locations imparts significant nutritional benefits, in terms of caloric intake, to participant households. The author very well frames the hypothesis in the standard economic theory and there are many more examples of his very deliberate approach to the writing of the thesis.

The thesis very often reads more like a research paper rather than a student’s thesis. The overall work of Felix Dent, including the writing style and exposition of econometric specification and results, are very good. In this thesis I found only a few minor problems such as the need to label the figures and tables in a better way so that they can be mostly read as standalone results without reading the text. The results (most importantly, he find strong evidence of a significant increase in household caloric intake in rural areas targeted by the program, driven primarily by increased consumption of DICONSA subsidised cereal products and corn grain in particular.) are well presented and contrasted with the existing academic research.

Felix Dent did an excellent job of doing an empirical analysis and writing a thesis. Therefore I recommend an overall grade of excellent (výborně, 1).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literature (max. 20 points)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods (max. 30 points)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution (max. 30 points)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript Form (max. 20 points)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL POINTS (max. 100 points)</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE (1 – 2 – 3 – 4)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


DATE OF EVALUATION: May 25, 2012
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL POINTS</th>
<th>GRADE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81 – 100</td>
<td>1 = excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 – 80</td>
<td>2 = good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 – 60</td>
<td>3 = satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 40</td>
<td>4 = fail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= výborně
= velmi dobře
= dobře
= nedoporučuji k obhajobě