

## Master Thesis Reviewer Report

Student: Ondrej Dobeš  
 Student Number: E18903  
 Title of Master Thesis: Analysis of Regional Innovation Systems – International Comparative Study  
 Aim of the Thesis: to analyse regional innovation systems in selected EU countries and to evaluate and compare them with the help of existing methodology.  
 Thesis Supervisor: Ing. Viktor Prokop, Ph.D.  
 Study Programme: RDG  
 Academic Year: 2020/2021

### Difficulty of the Topic

	Excellent	Very good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Cannot be evaluated
Theoretical knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Input data and their processing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Methods used	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Thesis Evaluation Criteria

	Excellent	Very good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Cannot be evaluated
Degree of achievement of the aim of the thesis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Original attitude to the topic processing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Adequacy of the methods used	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Depth of analysis (relative to topic)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Logical structure of the thesis and scope	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Working with Czech and foreign literature including citations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Formal arrangement of the thesis (text, charts, tables)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Language level (style, grammar, terminology)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Evaluation of the Master Thesis

The first chapter is devoted to innovation. This is a logical beginning of the work, but I do not see this part as necessary. Chapter is full of well-known facts obtained from the literature. The author's own invention is missing. In the context of the aim of the thesis, I would expect the author to pay more attention to the innovation infrastructure and the innovation environment. The author talks about these crucial concepts only very briefly,

Identification of the Record:  
 Agenda of Theses

.....

which I criticize as a mistake. In addition, again, I negatively assess the fact that the author submits the adopted parts of the text, which he does not process in any way (there is a lack of quality in literature research).

The second chapter focuses on innovative systems in space. The introduction to innovation cooperation (Chapter 2.1) should be more detailed and more logical. The processed text too copies the used literary sources. The author does not explain why he presents some facts and passages of the texts - typically a long bulleted list on page 36. In addition, he cites the source Mařátková (2013), which cannot be accepted as a source suitable for a diploma thesis. On page 38, illogical sentences are in bold, followed by bullets. I miss the meaning.

The author tried to make an overview of studies that evaluate regional innovation systems. I am afraid that in Table 3 he lists a completely inconsistent group of studies. The aim was not to analyse any individual studies, but methodologies for RIS evaluation! I do not understand at all how the author came to the conclusion that in his diploma thesis he will use the method of Mařátková, Stejskal (2011). This conclusion was certainly not made on the basis of the analysis in Table 3, as the author tries to pretend.

I see the only own contribution of the author in this part in table 4, where the author justified the use of individual RIS elements. However, I am not sure whether the author added any of the elements at all or whether he took over the method as it is.

The third part is devoted to the description of selected EU regions. I do not find the content of this chapter 20 pages!!!) useful. I do not understand why the macroeconomic indicators of individual countries are presented. In my opinion, this has nothing to do with the aim of the work, nor the method of analysis.

The fourth part concerns the methodology. The theoretical foundations of the used methods are described. Here without my reservations.

The author used Fuller triangle. However, he does not write how he found the weights that are essential. Without an explanation of this variable, the use of the method does not make sense. The question remains the mutual relation of the weights of variables (example: table 13 - weight B1 - existence of clusters is 0.4, which is the same weight as RT4 - Existence of operative outputs). Here I see the opportunity to ask the student during the defence to shed light on this relationship.

Another question is why he chose the four-point scale (0-3). Even the use of the scale itself can affect the results. Was the author based on any studies that also use a four-point scale?

Evaluation is performed in individual subchapters. However, I do not find in the attachments the "raw" data that would be needed to check the accuracy of the results.

Tables 17 - 19 list the occurrences of individual elements. Did the author also evaluate their quality? So is it enough for the RIS assessment that the element is located in a given region?

What does the author deduce from the fact that the values "NO" appear in Table 19 for the first time?

The conclusions and recommendations are rather on a theoretical level. They are very generally designed to be implemented in practice. Unfortunately, this is one of the weaknesses of this work.

Overall evaluation:

It is obvious that the author did not proceed with the processing of the work with the necessary expertise. The information is presented very superficially, without internal interconnectedness and strict logic.

I see the biggest weakness of the work in the methodology used, which in my opinion is not suitable for use at present. This methodology represented a large space for the author's work, which was unfortunately not used.

I appreciate the author's effort to obtain data for the evaluation of selected RIS in the given EU regions.

I am also sorry that the author did not use his potential and knowledge from practice to reformulate the theoretically concluded conclusions into clear recommendations for application in practice.

In my opinion, the work is marginally eligible for a recommendation for defence.

## Questions and Suggestions for Defence

The questions are included in reviewer report.

## Final Evaluation

I **recommend** the thesis for the defence.

I propose to grade this Master thesis as follows: **E**

In Pardubice 12.5.2021

Signature .....