



Erasmus Mundus Joint Master Degree in
Economics of Globalisation and European Integration

Academic Year 2015-2016

**DISSERTATION EVALUATION
READER'S FORM**

Dissertation title: **A COMPARISON OF THE UNCONVENTIONAL MONETARY POLICIES OF THE ECB AND THE FED**

Student's name: Matěj Bohúnek

Reader's name: Eric Pentecost

Here is brief reminder of the general instructions:

- 1) The dissertation should:
 - a. have an original empirical part, albeit of limited scope, OR
 - b. (in the best of cases) contribute to theory, OR
 - c. be a 'meta-empirical' study, i.e. a comparative study of empirical results, with particular care to synthesis, OR
 - d. be a thorough critical survey of the literature (empirical and/or theoretical).
- 2) The length of the dissertation should be kept within well-defined limits (8,000 to 12,000 words). Quality before quantity.
- 3) There should be proper attention to the citation of sources in footnotes or endnotes. The list of references should be carefully made.
- 4) The supervisor and the readers of the dissertation may perform checks on plagiarism. Citations should be made very explicit with quotation marks, indented text and quotation of the source in the main text. Quotations should be limited. Attempts of plagiarism will be severely dealt with, according to the examination regulations.

According to these general guidelines, please report the final overall grade on the next page, using the following grading system:

5	= 'excellent' (outstanding performance with no or only minor errors);
4,5 / 4	= 'very good' (above the average standard but with some errors);
3,5 / 3	= 'good' (generally sound work with a number of notable errors);
2,5 / 2	= 'satisfactory/sufficient' (pass; performance meets the minimum requirements);
1,5 / 1	= 'not sufficient' (marginal fail);
0,5 / 0	= 'poor' (fail).

In order to determine the final overall grade, it may be helpful to mark the dissertation on each one of the specific aspects mentioned on the next page, when they are relevant for the dissertation. However, the final grade does not necessarily have to be the simple average of these partial grades.

For the final overall grade you can use only integers or half-integers. To insert your mark, first click on "Choose a mark", then click on the arrow on the right, and finally select your mark from the drop-down list.

A short motivation of your grade will be much appreciated.

FINAL OVERALL GRADE:	0,5
-----------------------------	------------

Detailed appreciation:

Item	Mark (0 to 5)
Presentation	5
Is the dissertation well organised?	2
Is the list of references well organised?	4
Are the tables and figures well-presented and appropriately referenced?	4
Does the dissertation fit in the 12,000 words limit? (Penalise if you think the limit has not been reasonably respected.)	5
Literature review and references	2
Is there a good enough coverage of the literature that is reviewed?	2
Are the main relevant contributions included in the list of references?	1
Does the literature review clearly present the main questions and results of the literature?	1
Models and theoretical analysis	1
Is the choice of assumptions clearly motivated?	0
Is the choice of assumptions relevant?	0
If there are, what is the quality of the proofs?	0
Econometric analysis	0
Is the choice of the econometric model a relevant one?	0
Is the choice of econometric methods appropriate?	0
Are the main econometric problems (e.g. endogeneity) well dealt with?	0
Argumentation	
Is the dissertation well motivated?	1
Is the argumentation well-presented and clear?	1
What is the quality of the interpretation of the main results?	0
What is the degree of originality of the work?	0
What is the potential of the dissertation to lead to publication in an academic journal?	0
Working on the dissertation	
Has the student regularly worked on the dissertation all along the year?	
Was the student regularly in touch with the supervisor?	
Was the student understanding and taking account of the supervisor's remarks?	
Was the student really autonomous?	

Your general appreciation:

The dissertation is well-presented but really has little else to commend it. There is no empirical work other than time series plots; there is no hypothesis to test and no econometric analysis. The models set out (essentially two inconsistent versions of the IS-LM model, neither of which are fully understood, plus a note on the Quantity Theory of Money) none of which are relevant for the construction of a testable hypothesis on this topic. In short this dissertation is almost wholly descriptive. The textbooks models are not accurately described or used (confusion about shifts of and movements along curves; confusion about prices – which are fixed, but expected inflation is non-zero; diagrams 8 and 9 are confusingly identical; stock and flow aspects of the balance payments ignored). The empirical section is essentially a rather general description of the monetary policy actions of the FED and the ECB post 2008. Finally, the conclusions do not follow from the previous text nor do they address the title of the dissertation.

Since the project has none of the attributes required of a dissertation - listed under 1 above - it seems to me that this is a poor fail. Perhaps this was not a good choice of title?

Reader's signature:



Date: 5 October 2016



Erasmus Mundus Joint Master Degree in
Economics of Globalisation and European Integration

Academic Year 2015-2016

**DISSERTATION EVALUATION
SUPERVISOR'S FORM**

Dissertation title: A COMPARISON OF THE UNCONVENTIONAL MONETARY POLICIES OF THE ECB AND THE FED

Student's name: Matěj Bohúnek

Supervisor's name: Marcel Bluhm

Here is brief reminder of the general instructions:

- 1) The dissertation should:
 - a. have an original empirical part, albeit of limited scope, OR
 - b. (in the best of cases) contribute to theory, OR
 - c. be a 'meta-empirical' study, i.e. a comparative study of empirical results, with particular care to synthesis, OR
 - d. be a thorough critical survey of the literature (empirical and/or theoretical).
- 2) The length of the dissertation should be kept within well-defined limits (8,000 to 12,000 words). Quality before quantity.
- 3) There should be proper attention to the citation of sources in footnotes or endnotes. The list of references should be carefully made.
- 4) The supervisor and the readers of the dissertation may perform checks on plagiarism. Citations should be made very explicit with quotation marks, indented text and quotation of the source in the main text. Quotations should be limited. Attempts of plagiarism will be severely dealt with, according to the examination regulations.

According to these general guidelines, please report the final overall grade on the next page, using the following grading system:

5	= 'excellent' (outstanding performance with no or only minor errors);
4,5 / 4	= 'very good' (above the average standard but with some errors);
3,5 / 3	= 'good' (generally sound work with a number of notable errors);
2,5 / 2	= 'satisfactory/sufficient' (pass; performance meets the minimum requirements);
1,5 / 1	= 'not sufficient' (marginal fail);
0,5 / 0	= 'poor' (fail).

In order to determine the final overall grade, it may be helpful to mark the dissertation on each one of the specific aspects mentioned on the next page, when they are relevant for the dissertation. However, the final grade does not necessarily have to be the simple average of these partial grades.

For the final overall grade you can use only integers or half-integers. To insert your mark, first click on "Choose a mark", then click on the arrow on the right, and finally select your mark from the drop-down list.

A short motivation of your grade will be much appreciated.

FINAL OVERALL GRADE:	2,5
-----------------------------	------------

Detailed appreciation:

Item	Mark (0 to 5)
Presentation	3
Is the dissertation well organised?	
Is the list of references well organised?	
Are the tables and figures well-presented and appropriately referenced?	
Does the dissertation fit in the 12,000 words limit? (Penalise if you think the limit has not been reasonably respected.)	
Literature review and references	2
Is there a good enough coverage of the literature that is reviewed?	
Are the main relevant contributions included in the list of references?	
Does the literature review clearly present the main questions and results of the literature?	
Models and theoretical analysis	3
Is the choice of assumptions clearly motivated?	
Is the choice of assumptions relevant?	
If there are, what is the quality of the proofs?	
Econometric analysis	
Is the choice of the econometric model a relevant one?	
Is the choice of econometric methods appropriate?	
Are the main econometric problems (e.g. endogeneity) well dealt with?	
Argumentation	2
Is the dissertation well motivated?	
Is the argumentation well-presented and clear?	
What is the quality of the interpretation of the main results?	
What is the degree of originality of the work?	
What is the potential of the dissertation to lead to publication in an academic journal?	
Working on the dissertation	
Has the student regularly worked on the dissertation all along the year?	
Was the student regularly in touch with the supervisor?	
Was the student understanding and taking account of the supervisor's remarks?	
Was the student really autonomous?	

Your general appreciation:

In his thesis 'A COMPARISON OF THE UNCONVENTIONAL MONETARY POLICIES OF THE ECB AND THE FED', Mr Bohunek aims at (i) comparing non-standard monetary policy measures implemented by the ECB and the FED since the recent financial crisis and, (ii) assessing their success. Overall, the thesis only marginally passes the requirements, though neither of the requirements a)-d) outlined above seem really satisfactorily fulfilled. There are many analyses/comparisons of nonstandard FED and ECB policies, so the part designated 'empirical' by the author is not really novel. Furthermore, an extended Mundell-Fleming Model is lengthily reproduced/explained in the first half of the paper though the benefit for analysing non-standard monetary policies with that model is very limited. The points outlined by the author with the help of the model such as the liquidity trap could also have been carried out via referring to standard Keynesian theory. Besides these general weaknesses, a further number of notable mistakes result in an overall score of 2.5. First, at several instances the thesis' statements are unclear. For example, in the introduction, p. 9 first paragraph it is stated 'After a closer look at the nature of monetary policy in the developed world, significant progress in the past decade is apparent.' Which progress is meant here? Monetary policy progress? It also does not become clear in the remainder text which progress the author refers to in the introduction. Second, the author refers to non-existent equations. For example, on p. 15, first paragraph, the author refers to an equation 2.5 which does not exist. Third, the author has misunderstood a key concept he refers to in his analysis, stating on p. 24 that the quantity theory of money implies that 'The price level will rise, if the central bank increases the money supply'. This is only true if the growth rate in money supply exceeds the growth rate of real GDP. Fourth, the thesis features a number of typos and grammar mistakes. For example, on p. 26, second

paragraph: "I may be done by purchases of commercial paper...". Fifth, a separate literature review is largely missing (though the author quotes some literature going along his analyses). Sixth, the author

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David Ford", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Supervisor's signature:

Date: 20 October 2016