Report on Bachelor / Master Thesis

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

Student:	Eliska Jelinkova
Advisor:	Petr Jansky, Ph.D
Title of the thesis:	Estimating the Misalignment between the Locations of Profits and Economic Activities of EU's Banks

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

The language is a problem for this thesis. The proof reading is not done properly. There are quite a lot of grammar mistakes or typos in the text. Plus the style of the bibliography is not consistent and lack of standard. The author should also be more careful about the tables, eg: the mistakes of the factor unit in Table 6.1, etc. Thus, this leads to the points deduction in the "Manuscript Form".

The data description is not very clear and should be more in detail, only lisiting the countries and the name of the banks is not enough, it should include the sources and the statistics that has been chosen. As for the methodology, there is no econometric analysis at all, only the very simple ratio calculation and comparison are presented. The points of this part need to be discussed and based on the requirements of the program the author attended.

The results elaboration is less convincing. The tables are lack of statistical description through the whole results part, e.g. For Table 4.1, the author only mentioned that there are big differences but none of the statistics in the main result table is explained.

It is quite interesting that the author linked the research to the up to date Brexit issue, using the current knowledge to explain the practical economic issues need to be encouraged. However, the analysis of which banks will be impacted most by the Brexit seems irrelevant to the main topic of this thesis.

Most of the references come from report of institutions like OECD or PWC and some working papers, not much from authorized journals.

As for the contribution, it is less valuable for academic but maybe have more contribution to the market. It is more like a report than a research paper. The method is almost the same as the key references and only renewed by a newer dataset, the results are also obtained by the previous research. Not many original points are added.

In general, the work is less satisfactory for academic, but maybe will have more practical value.

I suggest grade between "2" and "3". If there is a proper explanation to the above concerns, I recommend "2" (good).

Suggested question for the defense: Why most of the references come from reports and working papers instead of authorized journals?

What contribution the paper brings to the field?

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

CATEGORY		POINTS
Literature	*(max. 20 points)*	*11*
Methods	*(max. 30 points)*	*20*
Contribution	*(max. 30 points)*	*20*
Manuscript Form	*(max. 20 points)*	*10*
TOTAL POINTS	*(max. 100 points)*	**61**
GRADE	*(1 – 2 – 3 – 4)*	*2*

NAME OF THE REFEREE: *Yao Wang*

DATE OF EVALUATION: *8.8.2016*

_____
Referee Signature