

REPORT ON THE MASTER THESIS

IEPS – International Economic and Political Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Title of the thesis:	The social Inequality and Green Energy: The case of India
Author of the thesis:	Shoumyadeep Rakshit
Referee (incl. titles):	Mgr. Michal Paulus

Remark: It is a standard at the FSV UK that the Referee's Report is at least 500 words long. In case you will assess the thesis as "non-defendable", please explain the concrete reasons for that in detail.

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

CATEGORY	POINTS
<i>Theoretical background (max. 20)</i>	15
<i>Contribution (max. 20)</i>	20
<i>Methods (max. 20)</i>	15
<i>Literature (max. 20)</i>	15
<i>Manuscript form (max. 20)</i>	7
TOTAL POINTS (max. 100)	72
The proposed grade (1-2-3-4)	2

You can even use a decimal point (e.g. giving the grade of 2.5 for 60 points).

Comments of the referee on the thesis highlights and shortcomings (following the 5 numbered aspects of your assessment indicated below).

1) Theoretical background:

The thesis is backed by relevant theoretical and philosophical concepts. Author also offers their detailed explanation.

2) Contribution:

The thesis offers interesting contribution in relating current state of development of India with potential green revolution in the country and philosophical treatment of inequality. The contribution and aim of the thesis is therefore very original which I appreciate a lot.

3) Methods:

The thesis is based on qualitative analysis of the inequality in India and relevant philosophical concepts. Concepts are well explained. However the core analysis should be written more clearly without any confusion. Main reasons behind unclarity of the analysis are described in the section 5 below.

The chapter starting on page 21 has a title "Hypotheses – I". However I have not found explicitly formulated hypotheses for further investigation in the chapter. The title is hence quite confusing, because the chapter is mainly about explanation of inequality in Indian society. The same is true for chapter Hypotheses – II.

4) Literature:

Author covers all main relevant sources. However there is one important weakness concerning the used sources in the paper. All tables in chapter "Hypotheses – II" have just one source: IRENA. Is this source trustworthy? Are the outcomes of this source backed also by other organizations and studies? These critical points are not clarified and it may harm credibility of those parts.

5) Manuscript form:

The manuscript form is the weakest part of the thesis. It unfortunately harms the clarity of the text while the idea of the thesis is very original. Below you will find several specific comments:

- I would welcome whole text to be structured in more paragraphs. Paragraphs in the paper are usually 1-page long that makes it hard for a reader to orient himself in the text.
- Chapter titles can be also numbered to clearly identify the position of each chapter/subchapter.
- I would also reduce Introduction to have more standard structure – few brief introductory paragraphs about the topic, summary of the topic and contribution, summary of results and structure of the paper.
- Introduction itself has several subchapters which seems to me confusing. Many aspects described in the Introduction can be moved into literature review.
- Hypotheses on page 21 have the same “chapter-level” as Literature Review chapter. Am I right? That would be strange...
- Number tables – e.g. on page 28. Also notes related to the table should be on the same page together with the table. Another example is on page 35. This point is unfortunately valid for whole paper.
- On page 46 there are several lines in different font style and size. Format of the text should be unified.
- The content of the table on page 51 and its message is not properly explained. A reader is lost in this case.
- Another round of proof-reading is necessary.

DATE OF EVALUATION: August 28, 2017



Referee Signature