Report on Bachelor / Master Thesis

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

Student:	Mariam Davladze
Advisor:	doc. Bc. Roman Horváth, M.A., Ph.D.
Title of the thesis:	The determinants of reform: The case of transition countries

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

The thesis measures spatial (cross-border) relationships in reform speed for a set of post-soviet economies. It does so for broad reform measures as well as for individual reforms and it finds evidence in support of cross-border reform 'spillovers'. While it is not the first paper to study the spatial patterns of reforms, it brings value added. (It could do a better job in clearly spelling out the value added vis-à-vis the existing literature, though.)

The empirical analysis appears to be carefully conducted; the author performs several sensitivity checks. I am not particularly familiar with the econometric methods employed here; they appear to be standard tools of spatial dynamic econometrics and I trust that the supervisor, who is an expert in this area, has checked their use.

The literature review is extensive and careful (in particular, the paper builds on the "greatly considerable results" of Campos and Horvath, 2012), but it is not effectively used to motivate the subsequent empirical analysis. The hypotheses are stated almost 'out of the blue' and some are hard to comprehend (hypothesis #3 being a case in point). The motivation does not get much more specific on pages 22/23 where econometric methodology is introduced. I don't mean to imply that the analysis is not well motivated, just that it the motivation could have been spelled out somewhat more forcefully.

The thesis is generally well written, even if the author struggles with his use of definite article and some sentences are bordering on incomprehensible. For example, "Despite the democracy each of other determinants are characterized with similar level and pattern of influence on the reforms tested by different authors." Overall, however, I think the quality of English does not distract from the main message of the study.

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

CATEGORY		POINTS
Literature	*(max. 20 points)*	15
Methods	*(max. 30 points)*	25
Contribution	*(max. 30 points)*	22
Manuscript Form	*(max. 20 points)*	15
TOTAL POINTS	*(max. 100 points)*	**77**
GRADE	**(1 – 2 – 3 – 4)**	**2**

NAME OF THE REFEREE: Stepan Jurajda
DATE OF EVALUATION:

Referee Signatur