

# Report on Bachelor Thesis

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

<b>Student:</b>	<b>Filip Vajskebr</b>
<b>Advisor:</b>	<b>Jana Votápková</b>
<b>Title of the thesis:</b>	<b>Efficiency in general medical practice in the Czech Republic</b>

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

*Please provide your assessment of each of the following four categories, summary and suggested questions for the discussion. The minimum length of the report is 300 words.*

The thesis estimates technical efficiency of a sample of 107 general practitioners in the period 2015-2017 operating in 79 different municipalities in the Czech Republic. The Stochastic frontier analysis is employed (SFA). Both the model with inefficiency determinants and without them is carried out. The thesis finds out that GPs in rural municipalities are less efficient, higher concentration of GPs in a municipality decreases efficiency and pediatricians are less efficient than GPs providing care to adults.

### **Contribution**

The thesis contributes both to the empirical efficiency literature and also may serve as the first insight for policymakers.

Healthcare efficiency literature is quite widespread abroad. Lately there appear a few studies analyzing Czech data too. However, only analysis dealing with Czech inpatient care are to be found. Such an analysis of primary/ambulatory care is a real pioneer in the Czech Republic. The topic should be of a primary interest to policymakers too since primary care consumes a large share of total expenditure on healthcare and influences the healthcare system as a whole.

Thus contribution of the thesis is obvious but I very much appreciate that Filip nicely sets his analysis into the context of both international and Czech literature and also highlights a potential for the practical application of the results.

### **Methods**

In the literature, there is a number of methods for measuring efficiency – the basic division include parametric and non-parametric methods, each having its advantages and disadvantages. The author uses the parametric (SFA) method which is absolutely appropriate for his purposes. Filip employs two parametric models – one of the incorporates inefficiency determinants into the mean of the distribution of inefficiency, the other one does not include any determinants. By definition, the resulting rankings of GP practices change between models. In the discussion section, Filip compares the efficiency rankings and well discusses the results.

I particularly like the way Filip copes with increased dimensionality of outputs of GP practices. Considering a relatively low number of observations, keeping all outputs in the analysis would bias the results. Filip however carries out a Principal component analysis and includes only 5 output variables which explain 76 % of the total variance.

### **Literature**

The literature review section reads well, it is well structured and backed by the literature.

### **Manuscript form**

The thesis is written in English, it is comprehensible and well structured. The thesis would benefit from proofreading and correction of minor typos, however.

# Report on Bachelor Thesis

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

<b>Student:</b>	<b>Filip Vajskebr</b>
<b>Advisor:</b>	<b>Jana Votápková</b>
<b>Title of the thesis:</b>	<b>Efficiency in general medical practice in the Czech Republic</b>

## Summary and suggested questions for the discussion during the defense

In sum, Filip has done a great deal of work and gained a lot of experience during the process of writing the thesis. At the beginning of the process, the flow of ideas was by no means structured, academic style was missing. Filip was however highly motivated during the process of writing the thesis. And the thesis now very much resembles a well structured piece of scholarly work and satisfies all requirements for a bachelor thesis. I thus recommend the thesis to be defended with **grade A** (excellent) if the opponent and the the comittee agree.

Filip answered all my questions while he was writing the thesis, thus I do not have any other serious comments. A question for discussion however may include:

1. What would the frontier would like if a non-parametric method was used (compared to the SFA)? Is there a way to incorporate inefficiency determinants into a non-parametric method? Describe theoretically the process.

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

<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
<i>Contribution</i> (max. 30 points)	27
<i>Methods</i> (max. 30 points)	27
<i>Literature</i> (max. 20 points)	18
<i>Manuscript Form</i> (max. 20 points)	19
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b> (max. 100 points)	<b>91</b>
<b>GRADE</b> (A – B – C – D – E – F)	<b>A</b>

## **NAME OF THE REFEREE:**

Jana Votápková

## **DATE OF EVALUATION:**

May 31, 2018



---

**Referee Signature**

**EXPLANATION OF CATEGORIES AND SCALE:**

**CONTRIBUTION:** *The author presents original ideas on the topic demonstrating critical thinking and ability to draw conclusions based on the knowledge of relevant theory and empirics. There is a distinct value added of the thesis.*

Strong            Average            Weak  
30                15                0

**METHODS:** *The tools used are relevant to the research question being investigated, and adequate to the author's level of studies. The thesis topic is comprehensively analyzed.*

Strong            Average            Weak  
30                15                0

**LITERATURE REVIEW:** *The thesis demonstrates author's full understanding and command of recent literature. The author quotes relevant literature in a proper way.*

Strong            Average            Weak  
20                10                0

**MANUSCRIPT FORM:** *The thesis is well structured. The student uses appropriate language and style, including academic format for graphs and tables. The text effectively refers to graphs and tables and disposes with a complete bibliography.*

Strong            Average            Weak  
20                10                0

**Overall grading:**

TOTAL	GRADE
91 – 100	A
81 - 90	B
71 - 80	C
61 – 70	D
51 – 60	E
0 – 50	F