

# MASTER'S EXAMINER REPORT

*GPS – Geopolitical Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University*

<b>Thesis title:</b>	<b>Development of the Arctic Geopolitics from the Perspective of Russia-US Relations</b>
<b>Name of Student:</b>	<b>Zou Shuyu</b>
<b>Referee (incl. titles):</b>	<b>Michael Romancov, Ph.D.</b>
<b>Report Due Date:</b>	<b>6/17/2021</b>

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

## **1) Contribution and argument:**

*What is the contribution of the work? Is the argumentation and research quality strong? Interpretation of own results, justified analyses, conclusions. Originality and independent scientific thinking.*

In his work, the author tried to present a comprehensive geopolitical and geoeconomic analysis of the Arctic region, which is undoubtedly one of the most important regions today. Unfortunately, his efforts did not lead to a positive result. It is not clear how he wanted to approach the issue. Readers were offered a number of approaches to the topic, but none of them were completed.

## **2) Theoretical and methodological framework:**

*Is the theoretical background relevant? Is there a sufficient theoretical framework applied? Are the applied methods relevant for answering the selected research questions and/or testing hypotheses? Are they used correctly?*

It is not clear what theoretical and methodological approach was chosen for the elaboration of the work. For example, on page 29 there is a mention of the Regional Security Complex Theory, which certainly represents a suitable approach, but there is no mention of it in places that the author declares as a theoretical and methodological chapter.

## **2) Sources and literature:**

*Is literature research relevant? Is the thesis situated in a broader context (field of research)? Quotation of sources.*

The list of literature and other sources used is relatively extensive, but this is its only positive. Many of the cited sources are completely unsuitable or directly inadmissible for the purpose of the master's thesis (Wikipedia).

## **4) Manuscript form and structure:**

*Are there any formal issues (logical coherence, layout, structure, tables, figures)?*

Links to resources are not made carefully. In many places in parentheses, the year of publication of the cited publication is missing, elsewhere we find only the year, but we have no idea who the author is (e. g. page 28).

## **5) Quality of presentation**

*What is the quality of presentation (language, style, cohesion)*

The text is obviously not carefully processed from a formal point of view. The author did not care about the final language adjustment. In the whole thesis, there is no single page on which there would not be a large number of typos and badly spelled words.

<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
<i>Contribution (research quality, analysis, and conclusions) (max. 40 points)</i>	8
<i>Theoretical and methodological framework (max. 25 points)</i>	3
<i>Sources and literature (max. 10 points)</i>	3
<i>Manuscript form and structure (max. 15 points)</i>	3
<i>Quality of presentation (grammar, style, coherence) (max. 10 points)</i>	3
<b>TOTAL POINTS (max. 100 points)</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>The proposed grade (A-B-C-D-E-F)</b>	<b>F</b>

**Suggested questions for the defence are:**

**I have no further questions.**

**I do not recommend the thesis for final defence.**

---

**Referee Signature**

**Overall grading scheme at FSV UK:**

TOTAL POINTS	GRADE	Quality standard
91 – 100	<b>A</b>	= outstanding (high honor)
81 – 90	<b>B</b>	= superior (honor)
71 – 80	<b>C</b>	= good
61 – 70	<b>D</b>	= satisfactory
51 – 60	<b>E</b>	= low pass at a margin of failure
0 – 50	<b>F</b>	= failing. The thesis is not recommended for defence.