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

Master thesis by Marko Titizov examines household choices on energy efficient devices in four European countries by using household-level data collected in REMODECE study. The thesis is divided into eight chapters with some tables in Appendix and verbatim of the Remodece questions in Annex.

After a brief introduction, literature is reviewed in Chapter 2. I would prefer more topics orientated review rather than a comprehensive review of quite many topics related to residential energy consumption and curtailment provided in the thesis. Some studies explicitly named in table 1 are not described in the review or even quoted (for ex., Dubin and McFadden). This chapter also misses conclusion, what is actually the state of the art and what are, if any, gaps in relevant research, and if any, which one is covered by presented study.

Chapter 3 describes in 2 pages labelling framework. It is no doubt very important part of the thesis, however, more might be said how the institutional framework is linked to the study and the survey which data Marko is using.

Chapter 4 describes data. I agree with Marko’s concern about representativitwitness of the REMODECE sample and respondents recruited from e-panel, however, I cannot agree with “due to mix of [sampling] techniques…it can be said that the selection of participants for the survey was random” (p. 19). Discussing the mode of survey administration and sampling from the REMODECE materials and data corroboration might be useful for discussing representativity of the sample and data used.

Chapter 5 actually continues describing data. I question some reported statistics, particularly the ones reported in Table 4 that shows, as example, 1,056 Czech respondents between the age of 19 to 65, while there are only 500 respondents in total. I do not see reason to report same information in both tables and figures (should be in Appendix). Overall, presentation of data might be done better.

Model - two stage Heckman selection model - is described in next chapter. I would appreciate Marko highlights how his model is linked to the models used in another studies, and if there are similarities, then his results might be compared with the results based on this model and specification for other countries covered by the Remodece survey. I like an intuition behind the direction of the effect of controls is provided by Marko. I like Marko controls for the effect of electricity price, however I would appreciate to diagnose outliers due to, most likely, measurement error related to self-reported data on energy bill and consumption (min=0.01 and max=0.28 € per kWh). His indexes are actually counts on how many saving activities have been performed; alternative approaches how to construct these indexes might be explored.
Chapter 7 presents the estimation results for several electric devices, at first energy class choice (second stage) and then efficiency rating awareness (first stage). In general, these results might be more and in detail commented and then some general conclusion provided.

Questions:

1. Model specification: the energy class choice (second stage of the model) is said to be estimated by ordered probit and the dependent variable has, depending on the device, four or three ordered values. Then, the model results should consist of three, or two respectively, intercepts (constants). But all models for each analyzed device (second stage) include only one constant. It seems to me that the second stage is estimated for continuous variable and not for ordered values. Please comment.

2. Should one care about the selection bias problem?

3. Could you summarize your results for energy class decisions and highlight main finding of your study?

I recommend „very good “(2) and suggest considering this thesis for one of the awards.
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