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1. Heuristic (please, evaluate by grade 1, 2, 3, 4 – in case of grading 3 and 4 the reviewer is obliged formulate critical points)

| Evaluation of the selection of literature and sources | 2 |
| Complexity of used sources from the perspective of the state of the art | 2 |

Short evaluation:
The selection of the literature results out of search, which was evolving along with the theme of interest. It is not a complex survey rendering the state of the art. To work with complete set of sources was not possible because the student had no previous knowledge of the studied topic and because of the limited time.

2. Research problém and its solution (please, evaluate by grade 1, 2, 3, 4 – in case of grading 3 and 4 the reviewer is obliged formulate critical points)

| Choice of the formulation of the research issue respects the task given to the student | 1 |
| The relevance of the goal from the perspective of research area methodology | 1 |

Short evaluation:
The theme of the research evolved gradually. The modernisation of Ottoman Capital and the role of Pera as a district with very particular character is in focus of urban historians. To apply Landry’s concept of creative city and Montgomery’s concept of Cultural district is relevant and well chosen. The pillar concepts used in the work – multiculturality, cultural district, cosmopolitanism are appropriately chosen. The theme is relevant for TEMA and it is within the mainstream research.

3. Thesis’ structure evaluation (please, evaluate by grade 1, 2, 3, 4 – in case of grading 3 and 4 the reviewer is obliged formulate critical points)

| 3.1 Is the structure of the thesis logical? | 2 |
| 3.2 Does the thesis’structure work along the methodology and methods declared in the introduction | 2 |

Short evaluation:
The thesis is divided into five parts and the structure is logical. The author however does not link the topics together well enough. It makes an impression of mozaik of relevant but independent cases.

4. Quality of analysis and interpretation (please, evaluate by grade 1, 2, 3, 4 – in case of grading 3 and 4 the reviewer is obliged formulate critical points)

| 4.1 Analysis of sources and literature | 3 |
| 4.2 Interpretation of sources and literature in their interaction | 3 |

Short evaluation:
The author has based his research on the reading of collection of reports on Pera from various sources – textual and pictorial – literary and scholarly publications, periodical press, posters,
The author has chosen to apply a panoramic presentation of the problems in his thesis, which makes impression of a la these argumentation, as there is an effort to prove the districts characteristics, which is not a novelty. Istanbul and Pera itself have inspired historical research from all possible perspectives. The author is convinced about the unique influence of multiculturality on the spatial organisation and contents of social life in Pera. He announces inspiration in McKay’s formulation of the role of belonging in the city. He uses it in sense of cohabitation and communication among people of different ethnicities and religions and establishing relationship towards the place. McKay together with Landry and Montgomery is a useful combination of approaches, however they should have been applied through the text individually, and all three in interaction. In the conclusion only Landry is applied.

5. Quality of the text (please, evaluate by grade 1, 2, 3, 4 – in case of grading 3 and 4 the reviewer is obliged formulate critical points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.1 Style and grammar</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Use of terminology</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Short evaluation:
Sami Bayram has made enormous progress in writing in English, The text is comprehensible, it almost reads well. It would benefit from more editorial care. The text does not follow one format of footnoting since the beginning till the end, which is distracting for the reader. The standard style of quotation marks is not respected. However the English is much better than in previous versions and previous texts of the author.
The author knows the terminology, but he does not sufficiently apply the concepts in the analysis. Multiculturality, multiethnicity, cosmopolitanism are concepts which cannot be used as synonyma.
6. Synthetic evaluation (500 signs):
The MA thesis presented by M. Sami Bayram shows that the author has learned to formulate a research question, and to create a set of relevant literature and sources. They were not complete. I would not see this as a major issue, because there is the strict schedule in TEMA program, which does not allow postponement of submission. I see the gap in analytical reading of sources. The contents of images retrieved from sources, the pictures and the maps should be analysed.

The thesis fulfills the basic requirements. The MA thesis can be accepted for defence.

7. Questions and comments which should the candidate answer and discuss during the defense:
Charles Landry has formulated and applied the concept of creative city / creative district on the cities of the 21st century. Why are you convinced that the concept works on the case of Pera in 19th century. Landry identifies the actors of creativity and its criteria and is mapping creativity. Can you specify the differences and similarities?

Suggested grade: Good – 3 in Czech and Hungarian grading system, C in ECTS.