

REVIEW OF THE BACHELOR'S THESIS SUPERVISOR

Student's name: Amira Kaid

Thesis title: Would Ronald Coase love Bitcoin? How Blockchain Lowers

Transaction Costs and Changes the Coasian Firm

Name of the thesis supervisor: Dominik Stroukal

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

Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:

Subsection 1.1: Great topic, interesting question, very current debate and I very much appreciate finally one of the not-boring titles.

Other (as appropriate): Finally, after a very long time I see a good theoretical work.

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.2 To what extent does the author use current / suitable sources?	⌘	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.3 How properly did the author select methods in respect of the topic?	⌘	<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 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:

Subsection 2.1: The work has standard academic structure. I personally do not like fourth-level subchapters but that's just the only thing I would change here.

Subsection 2.5: High.

Other (as appropriate):

3. Assessment of the thesis text quality:

3.1 How well – in terms of depth and quality – did the author analyze the topic?	⌘	<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 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 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 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 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:

Subsection 3.2: “The hypothesis in this thesis is that blockchain technology will reduce the role of the firm and the role of law in the Coasean framework.”

Subsection 3.3: It would require a book to fulfill the objective in its full length. But it is sufficient for a bachelor thesis.

Subsection 3.4: The work is theoretical and my grading of this part is thus grading of the whole work. I think it is an excellent, current and economically sound work.

Subsection 3.5: -

Subsection 3.6: There are numerous conclusions but it is very easy for reader to follow the text and see them.

Other (as appropriate):

4. Assessment of the thesis form and style:

4.1 What is the formal layout of the thesis?	฿	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.2 What is the quality of citations and references? Are sources identifiable?	฿	<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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:

Subsection 4.2: All sources are clearly identifiable. It is particularly hard for such a new topic as blockchain/crypto definitely is.

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

Amira Kaid presents new, interesting and witty (see the reference in the title of the second chapter) paper which I do recommend for the defense as excellent.

6. Questions and remarks to the defense:

1) Do you see any other (complementary) technology which today helps to lower transaction cost?

2) Personally, what is for you out of all the fields which can be revolutionized and you have described them in your thesis, the most groundbreaking?

Proposed grade: Excellent

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.

Date: 5.6.2017

.....

Signature of the Thesis Supervisor

NÁRODO
HOSPODÁŘSKÁ
FAKULTA
VŠE V PRAZE



Faculty of Economics of the University of Economics in Prague, nám. Winstona Churchilla 4, 130 67 Prague 3
Tel: +420 224 095 521, Fax: +420 224 221 718, URL: <http://nf.vse.cz>

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.