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What are the strengths and weaknesses of the thesis? Please give your reasons for the suggested grade in detail below.

1. **Does the author show understanding of one or more theories, and use theory to generate a hypothesis or to make the problem area more understandable.**

   Comments:

   The embedding of the discussion of homelessness in the context of neoliberal ideology and policy I believe is excellent, and provides a most useful background for the thesis main research objective, that is, the study of conceptualizations of homelessness. The discussion of theories of neoliberalism and the application of it in urban settings is very good. The discussion of revanchism and post-revanchism is most relevant and very nuanced.

2. **Is the research question articulated clearly and properly? Is the research question sufficiently answered in the conclusion?**

   Comments:

   The three research questions are good, even if somewhat open-ended. The research questions are answered at the end of the thesis, but I feel the discussion could have been more indepth, with a clear usage of the empirical data and reference to the theoretical discussion.

3. **Is the thesis based on relevant research and literature and does it accurately summarize and integrate the information?**

   Comments:

   The thesis contains a good discussion of both theoretical and empirical literature. I would have liked to see more discussion of methodological matters. For instance, how have the four categories (p. 33) been selected, how have the interviews been set up, what choices have been made in the coding?
4. What is the quality of the data or the other sources? Are the sample method, data collection and data analysis appropriate?

Comments:

The methods of interviewing and coding seem adequate. It remains however unclear to me how the coding has been used (it seems left undiscussed in the data reporting within the text; also the role of the network analysis remains rather unclear), and I also wonder in what matter the theoretical reflections on neoliberalism and post-socialism have conceptually informed the interview questions and analysis.

5. Are the findings relevant to the research question? Are the conclusions of the thesis based on strong arguments?

Comments:

The findings do surely relate to the research questions. I would have liked to see a more theoretically and conceptually driven discussion of the results.

6. Are the author’s thoughts distinguished unambiguously from the borrowed ideas?

Comments:

The author clearly identifies and discusses relevant literature and the research findings of others. It is clear what the personal contribution of the author is.

7. Is the thesis containing original/innovative research (in terms of topic, approach, and/or findings)?

Comments:

The thesis does contain original material on the basis of interviews and document analysis, even if this material could have been used more substantially. The data ought to have been used more explicitly in drawing some of the conclusions (as for instance when discussing sensitivity to problems of institutions).

8. What is the quality of style and other formal requirements?

Comments:

The style is certainly adequate. The empirical data discussion might have been less schematic and more fleshed out.

9. Are there any other strengths and weaknesses of the thesis, which are not included in the previous questions? Please list them if any.

Comments:
10. *What topic do you suggest for the discussion in the thesis defence?*

Comments:

The impact of neoliberal governance on urban social policy regarding homelessness in Prague.

Overall assessment of the thesis:

*(Please, state clearly whether the thesis is or is not recommended for a defence and write the main reasons for the recommendation).*

Proposed grade:

*(A- B: excellent, C-D: very good, E: good, F: fail)*

The thesis can be defended as it stands.

I suggest the grade C (very good)
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