

MASTER'S EXAMINER REPORT

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

Thesis title:	Geopolitics of Global Food Supply - An analysis of Nigeria, China, and the United States
Name of Student:	Olav M. Eeg-Henriksen
Referee (incl. titles):	Martin Riegl
Report Due Date:	August 30, 2021

The thesis has been checked by anti-plagiarism software.

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

1) Contribution and argument:

The author has chosen an interesting and geopolitically relevant topic that deserves deeper scholarly attention and investigation. While there are major shortcomings in research design (see comments below), an empirical analysis of three case studies presents an interesting insight and contribution to this, sometimes, neglected research topic (in geopolitics). Presented arguments and conclusions are correct, and one can agree with them, but as I argue later, an improvement of the methodological-theoretical part would be needed.

2) Theoretical and methodological framework:

The author has defined 4 research questions/hypotheses (1. The changing geopolitical framework towards a more multipolar world decreases the stability of the food supply. 2. The higher up on the income scale a country is, the safer is their food supply. 3. Sub Saharan Africa has the agricultural potential and capability to feed itself, and also support China with food. 4. Food prices need to rise to attract young farmers). It is important to say he does not really differentiate between research question and hypothesis as there is no research question defined. Also, there are no variables defined in the paper. As for the theories and methods, both are virtually missing in the paper. The author does not explain how his research will be theoretically framed, nor does he explain his method. This is not to say there is no method (the paper is based on a comparison of three case studies which are logically selected) applied in the paper, but the author do not describe it where appropriate. Should the author consult his paper with his advisor, all these deficiencies could be easily corrected.

3) Sources and literature:

The author relies mostly on empirical data which is appropriate due to the topic of the thesis, but still more theoretical literature would help the author to better frame his research.

4) Manuscript form and structure:

The thesis meets formal criteria, however, there is a lot of room for improvement. Typos (e.g. misspelling China/Chinese but more) occur quite often throughout the paper. In the list of sources, some items are in capitals, etc. This all gives the reader an impression, the paper was completed in a hurry.

5) Quality of presentation

The quality of language and style is appropriate. The presented text is coherent and allows fluent reading, but minor shortcomings (such as typos) appear quite often in the paper.

CATEGORY	POINTS
<i>Contribution (research quality, analysis, and conclusions) (max. 40 points)</i>	30
<i>Theoretical and methodological framework (max. 25 points)</i>	10
<i>Sources and literature (max. 10 points)</i>	8
<i>Manuscript form and structure (max. 15 points)</i>	11
<i>Quality of presentation (grammar, style, coherence) (max. 10 points)</i>	9
TOTAL POINTS (max. 100 points)	68
The proposed grade (A-B-C-D-E-F)	D

Suggested questions for the defence are:

I (do not) recommend the thesis for final defence.

Referee Signature

Overall grading scheme at FSV UK:

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