

# Report on Bachelor / Master Thesis

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

<b>Student:</b>	<b>Adam Peterka</b>
<b>Advisor:</b>	<b>Petr Pleticha</b>
<b>Title of the thesis:</b>	<b>Transport infrastructure and its impact on the economic growth in the EU</b>

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

### **Contribution**

The author explores the relationship between transport infrastructure and economic performance. Instead of following a single infrastructural project and estimating its impact, he relates GDP per capita with aggregate infrastructural stock in Europe and differentiates between the post-communist countries and the rest.

### **Methods**

The author uses standard methods that build on relevant literature. However, he occasionally does not manage to precisely explain the method and the related equations are not sufficiently explained (e.g. random effects model in section 4.1). There is also a strange statement of heteroskedasticity causing "higher than expected the t-statistics". Overall, however, the methods of the analysis as well as their explanation are adequate.

### **Literature**

The thesis does a decent job of explaining the papers it builds on. However, the literature review could be broader (e.g. review of analyses of individual projects) and deeper (e.g. methods of the analyses). It would be also worthwhile to compare the results of previous studies with those of the author. On the other hand, there are unnecessary details of methods that the author does not use in the thesis. That only confuses the reader and does not provide any value added to the paper.

### **Manuscript form**

The manuscript meets the criteria of a Bachelor's thesis. It is well-written and easy to read. The only issues are the listed equations where one sees what operations the author does but he does not give the reader the necessary rationale. The occasional typos or grammar errors could be handled by careful proofreading. The list of references is not consistent in its formatting, but that would be solved in a single additional round of comments.

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

In my opinion, the thesis meets the requirements of the program at IES, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University, I recommend it for the defense and suggest a grade C. It is relevant, the analytical work is adequate, and the manuscript is satisfactory. However, there still some shortcomings in the thesis. The interpretation of the coefficients is sometimes very confusing (for instance the interaction terms). The analysis is also quite brief – there is space for a deeper look into the heterogeneity of the GDP vs transport infrastructure relationship. The results of the Urkund analysis do not indicate significant text similarity with other available sources.

During the defense, I would like Adam to precisely explain the interpretation of the interaction coefficients. Also, I would like him to elaborate on the positive sign of the soc dummy coefficient. Lastly, he could focus a bit on policy implication of his paper and on ways his work can be improved so that the relevance for policy-making would be increased.

# Report on Bachelor / Master Thesis

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

<b>Student:</b>	<b>Adam Peterka</b>
<b>Advisor:</b>	<b>Petr Pleticha</b>
<b>Title of the thesis:</b>	<b>Transport infrastructure and its impact on the economic growth in the EU</b>

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

<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
<i>Contribution (max. 30 points)</i>	20
<i>Methods (max. 30 points)</i>	20
<i>Literature (max. 20 points)</i>	17
<i>Manuscript Form (max. 20 points)</i>	17
<b>TOTAL POINTS (max. 100 points)</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>GRADE (A – B – C – D – E – F)</b>	<b>C</b>

**NAME OF THE REFEREE:** Petr Pleticha

**DATE OF EVALUATION:** 3/8/2020

**Digitálně podepsáno (1.9.2020)**  
**Petr Pleticha**

---

**Referee Signature**

