Thesis Reviewer´s Report

Student:	Osborn Agyenim Boateng
Title:	Circular economy indicators as a supporting tool for regional development
Supervisor:	doc. Ing. Viktor Prokop, Ph.D.
Reviewer:	Ing. Solomon Gyamfi, Ph.D.
Reviewer's job title:	Assistant Professor

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 Master thesis sought to analyze the circular economy indicators influence on regional development. As a result, the main idea was to conceptualize circular economy and its impact on the development of regions gauging out the role public sector plays in ensuring environmental behavior of entities within the regional economic set up. Three EU countries were selected for the analysis., namely Germany, the Netherland, and the Czech Republic. The thesis describes an interesting topic and very crucial and current one as such.

The introduction followed an acceptable structure of the faculty but has few errors such as statement of research problem prior research in the field and the research gap leading to the statement of the research aim.

In the theoretical concept pertaining to CE despite the three selected EU countries, Netherland was used in many parts of this section. The theoretical analysis exploited all aspect of the concept and used quite new references and relevant literature in the field. The analysis however,

Last date and time of printout 20.12.2023 11:20

failed to link these concepts in relation to the topic. The thesis made just theoretical analysis, no apparent synergy of concepts. No research hypotheses were stated neither research questions.

For the methodology, the candidate outlines correctly all sections required but failed to cite literature to support the variables used for the empirical analysis.

The empirical analysis employed regression with Panel Data Model Selection with fixed effects with all R squared values extremely high. The results were illustrated by country specific in tables, however, no sources were given for the tables. The discussion failed to draw implications and linkages similarities or difference in the selected countries. However, the candidate worked sufficiently well in the discussions and citing references to support the findings.

There are a lot of formal errors and mistakes which could be avoided. First, quality of figures used, example figure 1 and 4, as well as all figures labelling are wrongly done. The formal caption of figures is to caption the headline and the sources if any and place them below the figure. The candidate for instance, refers to figure 8 in his discussion but the said figure is marked 14 (see section 2.6.3.) The candidate also failed to provide list of abbreviations with their meanings even though there are abbreviations in the work which have no full manifestations. There is also a lot of grammatical errors. None of the proposed literature in the thesis assignment's list of reference were used in the work. Annotation was not justified.

Despite all of these, the candidate worked well with the materials and all resources. Therefore, I conclude that the thesis fairly meets the requirement and I recommend the thesis for defence.

Questions and suggestions for the defence

1. Could the candidate explain why no research questions or hypothesis were stated?
2. Why was Netherlands the focus of the circular economy theoretical analysis part, that is chapter two? Is the candidate also aware of any EU country with better implementation of the CE Principles.
3. Which circular economy indicator(s) based on the findings of the research support(s) regional development?

Overall evaluation

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

In Pardubice on 20.12.2023

Signature