

# Opponent's Report on Dissertation Thesis

Institute of Economic Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University in Prague  
Opletalova 26, 110 00 Praha 1, Czech Republic  
Phone: +420 222 112 330, Fax: +420 222 112 304

Author:	<b>Ian Lively</b>
Advisor:	PhDr. Michal Bauer, PhD.
Title of the Thesis:	Three Essays on Post-Conflict Reintegration
Type of Defense:	<b>DEFENSE</b>
Date of Pre-Defense:	May 20, 2015
Opponent	<b>Jaromír Kovářík, Ph.D.</b>

Address the following questions in your report, please:

- a) Can you recognize an original contribution of the author?
- b) Is the thesis based on relevant references?
- c) Do the results of the thesis allow their publication in a respected economic journal?
- d) Are there any additional major comments on what should be improved?
- e) Were the comments raised at the pre-defense, addressed in the dissertation submitted to the regular defense?
- f) What is your overall assessment of the thesis? (a) I recommend the thesis to be defended without major changes; (b) The thesis is not defensible.

*(Note: The report should be at least 2 pages long.)*

---

## Content of the Report:

Bilbao (Spain), November 13, 2015

Dear colleagues,

I was already very positive about the previous version of the thesis of Ian Lively and found it more than defensible. A careful reading of the new, revised version only reinforces this assessment:

**I recommend the current thesis to be defensible without any changes.**

The revised version clearly shows Ian's ability to work independently both alone as well as in a team, and illustrates his knowledge of the literature in several disciplines. I am strongly convinced that the "not-yet-published" parts of the thesis will be published in highly respected economic journals soon.

As for the comments of the opponents, I am satisfied with how Ian approached them. All of the comments were minor and Ian targeted them without any problem. From Ian's response to the individual comments, it is evident that Ian thought carefully about each of the raised points and had no major problem targeting them. Even though some of them were not solvable due to data unavailability, Ian at least provides extensions of the texts that meditate about the potential resulting issues in each chapter. I find this highly professional and the individual chapters have improved as a result of these changes. I am also happy with how Ian targeted my own comments and have no further ones.

I will probably repeat my pre-defense assessments, but I believe we look at an exemplary thesis. I particularly like the span of the thesis in terms of (i) topics, (ii) the literatures from all the related (sub)disciplines, and (iii) methodologies both from the experimental and econometric perspectives. This opens him many fields, in which to research in the future. I wish all theses in my own University were as broad as Ian's.

In sum, I have no further comments on the content of the thesis and find it defensible in the current format, as it is.

I wish Ian the best of luck and hope that Ian will pursue an academic research career in the future. This would only be good for the science.

Please, do not hesitate to contact me for more information.

With sincerely,

Jaromír Kovářik, Ph.D.  
University of the Basque Country & CERGE-EI  
[jaromir.kovarik@ehu.eus](mailto:jaromir.kovarik@ehu.eus)

Date:	
Opponent's Signature:	
Opponent's Affiliation:	<b>Jaromír Kovářik, Ph.D.</b> Universidad del País Vasco, Spain