1/2

Last date and time of printout 19.8.2023 16:

Thesis Reviewer's Report

Student: Peter Tindan Jacob

Title: Country attractiveness evaluation and visualization

Supervisor: prof. Jitka Komárková
Reviewer: assoc. prof. Viktor Prokop
Reviewer's job title: Assoc. prof., FEA UPCE

Assessment criteria

	excellent	very good	acceptable	unacceptable	N/A
Achievement of the aims of the thesis				x	
Use of appropriate methods			X		
Depth of analysis (in relation to the topic)				X	
Structure and extent of the thesis			X		
Use of Czech and foreign sources (including references)			X		
Formal aspects (text, diagrams, charts)			X		
Quality of language (style, grammar, terminology)			X		

Usability of the results

	high	medium	low	N/A
In theory			X	
In practice			X	

Other comments

First of all, the student states that he focused on the countries of Central Europe, but some of the selected countries are at least debatable regarding their inclusion in Central Europe.

The student's work with literature is weak in some passages. For example, pages 10-12, where the author uses only one, very outdated source. In addition, the student uses different fonts in his thesis. For example, the page numbering is a different font than the text of the thesis.

Page 15: the student should be more attentive when presenting his work. On this page, he refers to Porter's diamond in bold, but he is unable to spell the surname of such an important scientist correctly.

I also generally don't understand why the author starts with global competition as the first chapter. A better introduction of the reader to the issues of this work would be appropriate. I would also expect a better definition of basic/key terms. Why competitiveness? How is competitiveness linked with attractiveness?

Page 17 – Why regional competitiveness? The author should better define how he understands the term region in his work and what unit represents the region? Is it one country? Or is it part of one country or a grouping of several states?

Part 2.1 - the text is confusing, the author should work better with the text, also use bullet points, and make it easier for the reader to read his work. On which of the many definitions given by the author does he based his work?

Entry ID:

Page 24 – The author refers to the author "Roberta, 2011" but, there is no reference to this author. The author may have meant the author Roberta Capello, but even this important author is not cited in the text.

Table 2.1 - For this table, I would expect more effort from the author - on the one hand, I would also expect the author's own contribution, for example regarding the evaluation of the selected determinants. At the same time, I would expect information about which states these determinants were used for. Are they suitable for Central European countries? Are there really only 5 determinants as presented in the table? Why does the author write the abbreviations of the authors' first names for some citations and not for other citations in the same table?

Part 2.5: Conceptual framework is confusing; I do not understand exactly the intention of the author and at the same time the framework proposed in this way is not completely in line with the aim of the work. Moreover, the author writes about explanatory variables, but the author does not mention any "explained variable". If the author works with explanatory variables, I expect a statistical analysis of the effect of these determinants on the chosen dependent variable.

I do not understand, why the author presents "conclusion" on the page 37. Moreover, the authors states that "various studies, their methodology, the findings and measurement variables have been taken into cognizance". But, in the table 2.1, he presented only 5 studies.

Rational for selected countries is very weak and I miss better justification of the choice of countries and a better description of the examined states, also using references to relevant literature.

I do not understand, why the author "discusses" significance of the study and study limitations in the part 3.

Part Results and analysis – the author states "...the need to evaluate the specific areas that contribute to a country's level of attractiveness for FDI". Next, he states: "...variables used for the visualizations are GDP, FDI, Political Stability, Government Effectiveness, and Infrastructure in terms of broadband internet access...". What is the role of FDI? Is FDI understood as a determinant affecting attractiveness or as a desired output?

"Analysis" in sections 4.1-4.5, the author only described whether the values in the tables increased or decreased and how many years these values increased and how many years decreased. I appreciate the visualization, but I miss deeper analysis from the author and more added value.

Section 4.8, the author states that "economists use" and that "the view of economists", But, the author does not list the specific studies to which he refers. So these arguments are not relevant and credible. Moreover, I really don't understand, why the author analyses relationships between GDP per capita and Political stability, two out of five selected "determinants". What about other determinants and its links/relationships? How this part contributes to meet the aim of this thesis?

Page 72: The author states: "Considering the impact of FDI as a percentage of GDP...", but, I don't understand, what impact the author intend? Moreover, the author's conclusions are very weak and vague. These are not proven influences, as the author claims and relies on, but certain assumptions on the part of the author. The author presented tables where the values of the selected variables were discussed and subsequently expects that these "determinants" are linked together. However, the author did not test the effects of other factors that could also have an effect on the attractiveness of the analysed areas. At the same time, the authors recommendations are very general and weak, e.g., page 72: "...they might have put in strategies that sent a positive signal to the investment community about their improvements in the attractiveness of the investment". What specific strategies does the author mean in the analysed states? Who belongs to the investment community? Does everyone in this community have the same interests/requirements/expectations?

Part 5.2 - I don't understand why the author suddenly brings a new concept to his thesis, namely leadership. The same applies, for example, to Stakeholders' Decision Making. These sections are very general and do not provide any specific recommendations. The added value is almost zero.

I also lack a final evaluation of this work, for example in the form of a separate chapter "Conclusions".

Summing up, the work is done at a very low level and the work lacks a comprehensive method/instruction for evaluating the attractiveness of countries/regions. For this reason, I am not convinced of the fulfilment of the aim of this work and do not recommend it for defence.

Questions and suggestions for the defence

The author should respond to my comments and questions above. At the same time, I am interested in how this study "enables the detection of geographical patterns", as claimed on page 40.

Overall evaluation

I **do not recommend** the thesis for defence. The proposed grade for the thesis: F

In Pardubice on 19.8.2023 Signature: Viktor Prokop, b.o.h.

Theses 2/2