Thesis Reviewer´s Report

Student:	Sabiu Gariba Mohammed
Title:	The impact of state aid on the firms´ innovation performance: an international comparative study
Supervisor:	prof. Ing. Jan Stejskal, Ph.D.
Reviewer:	Assoc. Prof. Dr. Viktor Prokop
Reviewer's job title:	Associate Professor, Science and Research Centre, 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

The author of the diploma thesis has chosen a very current topic. In the theoretical part, the author works with a large number of foreign sources, and I especially appreciate the overview table on the page 16. I would only criticize the fact that this table could have been more detailed and contained more studies. I don't have many comments on the theoretical part, just the author could have had a more uniform formal arrangement.

The third chapter describes the data and methodology. I would appreciate if the author better argued the choice of research sample (some arguments could be find in the part 3.4 – but there is no literature support for those arguments so I'm not sure if they are true or just the author's assumptions). Furthermore, it is common for research questions / hypotheses / etc. that they are defined at the end of the theoretical framework and supported by citations of relevant sources. Here, I do not see the authors argumentation line and the potential reader do not know why the author defined his hypotheses in that way.

In Table 2 (page 40), the author defines his variables. For some variables, it would be better to use „more strong" arguments and references – e.g. for absorptive capacity. Similarly, the author defines variable „*Number of Researchers*", but „*the cooperation of SME´s in R&D*" is provided as the explanation.

In fig. 2 (page 44), the author shows (as output) „product innovation" but, in the Table 2, he declares „product and service" innovation. I am convinced that this is only the author's inattention. Part 3.8 (limitations) should be at the end of the thesis (usually in conclusion part).

Chosen data method and research procedure are adequate.

Table 3 on page 46 presents a correlation matrix - I do not understand why the GDP variable, which is not described in Table 2, is presented in this table? I expect that the author forgot to list the variable in Tab. 2. The author also introduces abbreviations that are not explained in the work and some of them are hard to understand. The author did not explain why in Tables 4 and 5 he states "LOG" values + he did not state what "LOG" means. The title of Table 4 is misleading. For the Table 5, the source is above the table. In Figure 3, the author did not explain what values are shown on the arrows. The negative effect of variables is usually represented by a dashed arrow.

I have no comments on the rest of the thesis. All that is needed is that the author's recommendations are also supported by citations or examples of good practice.

Questions and suggestions for the defence

Based on your results, provide specific recommendations for each of the V4 countries.

Overall evaluation

I **recommend** the thesis for defence.
The proposed grade for the thesis: D

In Pardubice on 30.5.2022

Signature