

Thesis Reviewer's Report

Student: George Baafi Boateng
 Title: E21890
 Supervisor: Ing. Solomon Gyamfi, Ph.D.
 Reviewer: Ing. Martin Maštálka, Ph.D.
 Reviewer's job title: assistant professor, University of Pardubice

Assessment criteria

| | excellent | very good | acceptable | unacceptable | N/A |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Achievement of the aims of the thesis | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Use of appropriate methods | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Depth of analysis (in relation to the topic) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Structure and extent of the thesis | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Use of Czech and foreign sources (including references) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Formal aspects (text, diagrams, charts) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Quality of language (style, grammar, terminology) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Usability of the results

| | high | medium | low | N/A |
|-------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| In theory | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| In practice | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Other comments

The aim the thesis was to examine the sustainable development policies of selected EU member state using triple bottom line theory in a comparative case study analysis. In the theoretical part of the thesis the student introduced theoretical background for the further research. The student described the methodology of his research, and he provided three research objectives.

According to the reviewer's opinion, the theoretical part was missing some basic points: Neither The Our Common Future (Brundtland) report (1987) was not mentioned in the definition of the sustainable development (c. 1.1, p. 13) nor the The Limits to Growth (by Meadows, Club of Rome, 1972). The MDGs (Millenium Development Goals) were very successful and important ancestors of the contemporary SDGs but they were not described as well.

The core of the practical part of the thesis was represented by the analyses and assess of the EU Sustainable Development Policies implemented in Romania and Sweeden. It was not clear why these two countries were chosen for the study (despite the fact, that it was Finland which has been evaluated as the best country in the Sustainable Development Reports three times in a row since 2021; Cyprus and Bulgaria were ranked as the worst in the EU on the other side). Student analysed national documents and developed some outputs from his survey. Unfortunately, there were no objective and measurable indicators established in the methodology. The SDGs, SDG Index, which are published on the one-year-basis and published by the Sustainable Development Solutions

Network (SDSN), were not used. The only clear synoptical outputs from the survey could be seen in the Table 2 (p. 50).

The analytical part of the thesis was very deep and precise despite the facts mentioned above.

The formal aspect of thesis was convenient. Student used suitable expressions as well as eligible table.

The presented document fulfilled all the criteria for the level of the Master's thesis. I recommend the thesis for the defence.

Questions and suggestions for the defence

Explain the added value of your thesis in relation to the Sustainable Development Reports (by SDSN).

What are the main differences in conclusions between your study and the Sustainable Development Report 2023?

Overall evaluation

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

The proposed grade for the thesis: C

In Pardubice on 13.8.2023

Signature