

# Report on Bachelor / Master Thesis

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

<b>Student:</b>	<b>Jakub Losenický</b>
<b>Advisor:</b>	<b>Mgr. Jana Votápková</b>
<b>Title of the thesis:</b>	<b>Social and Medical Costs of Dupuytren's Disease</b>

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

The thesis examines the relative cost-effectiveness of two medical treatment methods of the Dupuytren's disease. Author explores not only medical costs but also the social costs related to treatments. In his analysis he distinguishes between several types of patients regarding their type of occupation and compares the results. The analysis focuses on the effects on budget deficit. In other words author is trying to assess which treatment method is more costly for the government when the medical and also social costs are taken into account.

In general the thesis sufficiently meets all relevant criteria for a bachelor thesis. Therefore I would grade it as excellent. The general assessment of the evaluated categories is following:

### **LITERATURE REVIEW:**

Author covers the literature sufficiently. He summarizes literature dealing with the HTA, methods of analysis, but he also focuses on the medical side of the disease and both treatment methods.

I would recommend stressing more the relationship of the HTA to the analysis of the author. Since 5<sup>th</sup> chapter there is no note about the HTA which I expected at least in the discussion or conclusion. The thesis then consists of two parts which are not properly interconnected.

Hence I decrease 1 point because of this remark in this category.

### **METHODS:**

The methods are adequate. However better explanations should be added in specific parts. The main problem is in the chapter 2, where the author presents several methods used in the HTA. He chooses one of these methods in his analysis. However the reason why other methods were abandoned is not explained. I would recommend the author to focus more on explanations why he is choosing particular methodologies next time.

Another minor comment related to this issue concerns chapter 5.1. On page 23 the constraint of the function to be minimized should be better explained. Especially the purpose of the value "2" is unclear.

The reader would also appreciate if there would be described more the difference between the standard Czech attitude to this analysis and author's extension. My key question reading the thesis is, what is that difference in estimation between the two attitudes? How would the estimation look like if the standard attitude took place? Then it would be better to see the value added of the work.

In case of a master thesis the discussion about the assumptions simplifying the analysis (or adjusting the model to data) should be much more detailed and also critical. However the thesis is bachelor, hence I do not regard the state of the discussion about assumptions as problematic.

Hence I decrease the grading by 5 points although that this critique may belong to "Literature review" part.

### **CONTRIBUTION:**

Concerning the standards of bachelor theses I regard the contribution as highly sufficient. The thesis contributes to the empirical literature focused on the Czech Republic by incorporating social costs in the analysis. Hence the thesis should meet the bachelor criteria without any problem.

# Report on Bachelor / Master Thesis

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

<b>Student:</b>	<b>Jakub Losenický</b>
<b>Advisor:</b>	<b>Mgr. Jana Votápková</b>
<b>Title of the thesis:</b>	<b>Social and Medical Costs of Dupuytren's Disease</b>

## **MANUSCRIPT FORM:**

The thesis includes few typos (e.g. p.5, line 3: "acCUA").

Then I was confused by footnotes in Czech. I was not sure, whether the footnote is a Czech translation of a term or more explanation. Very likely it was the second choice, but then the English term was missing. Hence for an English speaking reader this part would be totally unclear.

Hence I decrease the grading by 3 points in this category.

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

<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
<i>Literature</i> (max. 20 points)	19
<i>Methods</i> (max. 30 points)	25
<i>Contribution</i> (max. 30 points)	30
<i>Manuscript Form</i> (max. 20 points)	17
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b> (max. 100 points)	<b>91</b>
<b>GRADE</b> (1 – 2 – 3 – 4)	<b>1</b>

**NAME OF THE REFEREE:** *Michal Paulus*

**DATE OF EVALUATION:** *September 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2014*



Referee Signature