

## REVIEW OF THE BACHELOR'S THESIS EXTERNAL REVIEWER

Student's name: ADHAM MOHAMED WAHIRED DAHY .....

Thesis title: DETERMINANTS OF THE SHARING ECONOMY EMERGENCE; AN  
EXPERIMENTAL STUDY

Name of the thesis external reviewer: Jaromír Prokop .....

	1	2	3	4
<b>Assessment of the topic itself</b> (irrespectively of the student):				
1.1 To what extent is the topic current and significant?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2 How challenging is the topic in respect of theoretical knowledge?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3 How challenging it in respect of practical experience or fieldwork?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.4 How difficult is it to get background materials?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### **Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:**

*Subsection 1.1: I consider the chosen topic as very current and significant; we are speaking about the emerging of new type of business which is challenging for many related subjects: because it changes completely the longstanding rules, processes, expectations, so companies have to adapt to these new conditions.*

*Other (as appropriate): 1.2, 1.3, 1.4: I think that very challenging was to choose the proper information and data from the previously issued discussion papers and analyses. The Author introduced perfectly the history and current perception of sharing economy.*

### **2. Evaluation of the thesis structure and logical cohesion:**

2.1 To what extent is the thesis structure logical and transparent?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.2 To what extent does the author use current / suitable sources?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.3 How properly did the author select methods in respect of the topic?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.4 How sufficiently and functionally did the author use in the thesis original charts, tables, data, annexes, etc.?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.5 What is the compatibility level for the thesis basic line elements: topic – thesis assignment – objective – structure – conclusions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### **Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:**

*Subsection 2.1: The thesis structure can be considered as fully logical and transparent. It was easy to follow the main structure of work during the reading the thesis. Subsection 2.5: According to subsection 2.1 the mutual compatibility of the all main parts is sufficient and the particular parts are perfectly linked in the logical order.*

*Instructions for the review: Author of the review must provide verbal assessment for the specified subsections, which are pivotal for the thesis assessment, particularly for the defense; therefore, the assessment must have reasonable explanatory power.*

*Note: Classification method: 1 = exceptional, 2 = very good, 3 = good, 4 = failed.*

*Other (as appropriate): 2.4 the presented charts and tables helps significantly to introducing and understanding the presented findings.*

---

### **3. Assessment of the thesis text quality:**

- |  |                                     |                                     |                          |                          |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 3.1 How well – in terms of depth and quality – did the author analyze the topic?   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3.2 Did the author formulate the thesis objective clearly and with logical structure?                                      | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3.3 Did the author fulfill the defined thesis objective and approved assignment of the thesis that contains the objective? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3.4 How well – in terms of depth and quality – did the author cover the theoretical part of the thesis?                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3.5 How well – in terms of depth and quality – did the author cover the practical / analytical part of the thesis?         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3.6 To what extent are the thesis conclusions logically structured and show quality, and what is their added value?        | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

#### **Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:**

*Subsection 3.2: The author formulated the main objectives very clearly, with the logical structure towards the overall content of the bachelor's thesis.*

*Subsection 3.3: The author fulfilled the defined objectives in its entirety and quality. There were also mentioned the possible areas for further analyses. The limitation of study and presented conclusion were also discussed and explained.*

*Subsection 3.4: The theoretical part is described and analyzed in the broad extent, detail and proficiency, it fully follows the given requirements and logical structure of this thesis, also the critical analysis of used theory is properly mentioned.*

*Subsection 3.5: The practical part (regression analyses) from the proper analytical point of view is stated in sufficient and detailed level and extent and properly applied.*

*Subsection 3.6: The thesis conclusions are logically structured and correspond to the stated aims and objectives.*

*Other (as appropriate):*

---

### **4. Assessment of the thesis form and style:**

- |  |                                     |                          |                          |                          |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 4.1 What is the formal layout of the thesis?   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4.2 What is the quality of citations and references? Are sources identifiable?                       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4.3 What is the stylistic level of the thesis, particularly the use of correct economic terminology? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

#### **Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:**

*Subsection 4.2: The quality of citations and references is very good and appropriately used in the thesis content, the sources are identifiable.*

*Other (as appropriate):*

---

### **5. Overall assessment (It is necessary to state, whether the thesis meets the requirements of the Methodology of the Faculty of Economics in terms of the quality of contents, scope and**

<p><i>Instructions for the review: Author of the review must provide verbal assessment for the specified subsections, which are pivotal for the thesis assessment, particularly for the defense; therefore, the assessment must have reasonable explanatory power.</i></p> <p><i>Note: Classification method: 1 = exceptional, 2 = very good, 3 = good, 4 = failed.</i></p>
---

*formal requirements, whether the thesis is/is not recommended for defense. It may also be nominated for a special award, etc.):*

*Mr. Adham Mohamed Wahired Dahy completed his bachelor thesis according to the given requirements of Methodology of the Faculty of Economics in terms of the quality of contents, and formal requirements. The regression analyses, subsequent tests and primary research for hypothesis confirmation were used very professionally. The structure of the whole material is very clear. The practical part is very well organized and system of presented implementation of linear regression model significantly helped to understand presented conclusions. I would like to point out that the author provided practical part in the exceptional level. I think that this thesis is very useful for everybody who wants to understand the main aspects of sharing economy.*

*This thesis is recommended to defense.*

**6. Questions and remarks to the defense:**

- 1. You stated that the sharing economy gained much of its current popularity because of events of the Great Depression; do you think that businesses related to the sharing economy can be threatened by the current growth of economies?*
- 2. What can be the main strategies which can change the risk preferences for supporting the sharing economy?*
- 3. Do you think that the currently used rating systems of information cascades can be improved?*

**Proposed grade: 1 – exceptional**

Date: 5. 6. 2016

.....  
Signature of the Thesis External Reviewer

<p><i>Instructions for the review: Author of the review must provide verbal assessment for the specified subsections, which are pivotal for the thesis assessment, particularly for the defense; therefore, the assessment must have reasonable explanatory power.</i></p> <p><i>Note: Classification method: 1 = exceptional, 2 = very good, 3 = good, 4 = failed.</i></p>
---