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

Academic Year 2015-2016

DISSERTATION EVALUATION
READER'S FORM

Dissertation title: Assessment of the effects of sanctions on trade between the EU and Russia

Student's name: **Kolarova Andrea**

Reader's name: Nicola Coniglio (University of Bari)

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:	3,5

Detailed appreciation:

Item	Mark (0 to 5)
Presentation	4,5
Is the dissertation well organised?	4,5
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 worlds limit? (Penalise if you think the limit has not been reasonably respected.)	3
Literature review and references	3
Is there a good enough coverage of the literature that is reviewed?	4
Are the main relevant contributions included in the list of references?	4
Does the literature review clearly present the main questions and results of the literature?	4
Models and theoretical analysis	Not applicable
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	3
Is the choice of the econometric model a relevant one?	2,5
Is the choice of econometric methods appropriate?	3
Are the main econometric problems (e.g. endogeneity) well dealt with?	3
Argumentation	4
Is the dissertation well motivated?	4
Is the argumentation well-presented and clear?	4
What is the quality of the interpretation of the main results?	3,5
What is the degree of originality of the work?	4
What is the potential of the dissertation to lead to publication in an academic journal?	2
Working on the dissertation	Not applicable
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 thesis is well-presented and well-written. The literature has been extensively covered. Some parts of the thisis are in my view superfluous (as the thesis is already quite long).
The weak point is the empirical part. The methodological issues have been correctly discussed but then rather surprisingly the exercise has been conducted in a sub-optimal way .... Very few countries ... few observations .... All the countries are EU and hence non variation in the application of sanctions.
I'm not lowering the mark of half-point has I do not have information on the reasons why this choice was made; more importantly what was the role of the supervisor in this choice...

Reader's signature: Nicola D. Coniglio Date: 12/10/2016