

Master's Thesis Evaluation by the Opponent

Title of the Master's Thesis:

Economics of Well-being and Mental Health: A cost-of-illness analysis on Mental Health in Denmark

Author of the Master's Thesis:

Hannah Sophie Becher

Goals of the Master's Thesis:

To estimate additional healthcare and non-healthcare costs of low/moderate mental well-being compared to high mental well-being for the Danish society in 2017.

Evaluation:

	Criteria	Description	Max. points	Points
Content 70%	Output Quality	Results are well presented, discussed - substantiated, relevant and original (i.e. novelty produced by the author). They are of high practical/theoretical relevance.	20	19
	Goals	The goals of the thesis are evident and accomplished.	10	9
	Methodology:	Methods are adequate and used correctly in relation to pre-set goals.	20	19
	Theory/ Conceptualization:	Demonstration of an in-depth understanding of the topic area (state-of-the-art) including key concepts, terminology, theories, definitions, etc. based on a literature survey. Literature review.	20	19
Formal requirements 15%	Structure:	The thesis is a consistent, well-organised logical whole.	3	1
	Terminology:	Linguistic and terminological level.	4	4
	Formalities:	Formal layout and requirements, extent, abstract.	4	3
	Citing:	Quality of citations and reflection of Ephorus results.	4	3
Delivery 15 %	Presentation document:	Is the presentation itself structured in a clear way? Is it appealing and easy to follow? Does it convey the message efficiently?	5	
	Presentation skills:	Are you conveying the message efficiently and timely? Do you use appropriate words, speed, tone of voice, gestures, movement etc. to express your thoughts in a clear manner?	5	
	Argumentation:	Are you able to readily and briskly react to questions or comments? Are you able to explain unclear parts and connect comments to relevant places in your presentation or parts of particular analyses? How well are you able to defend to your ideas and recommendations?	5	

Other comments:

The thesis addresses a relevant and up-to-date topic. The author demonstrates that she has mastered a large amount of literature. The research question and answer are clearly stated. The discussion of the results is of good quality. The areas for improvement are as follows.

1) The paper should be much more focused on its specific goal. There is no need to discuss the definition of economics or Greek philosophy.

2) It is not necessary to explain what OLS is or to include the formula for standard deviation. You should assume that your readers have some basic knowledge of economics and statistics.

3) Overall, the paper is very imbalanced. There are sections that are outstanding (1, 4.3, 4.4), and there are sections that discuss irrelevant topics (2.3).

4) The paper is also too long. The analysis begins only on page 55.

5) The gap in the literature, which the paper attempts to fill, should be emphasized better.

In sum, I believe that this could be a great thesis if the author deleted several sections and structured her argument better. The topic has great potential, and I encourage her to work on it further, whether in academia or in business.

Questions or comments to be discussed during the thesis defence:

1) Are the calculated costs of low/moderate well-being high or low compared to the costs calculated in prior literature? Can you explain the differences?

2) In Section 5 you discuss treatment and prevention, including ABC. Are there any estimates of the costs of ABC?

3) I think your critique of output vs. happiness welfare indices goes too far. What is the correlation between GDP/capita and happiness indices? Why would a government of a country introduce a happiness index instead of GDP/capita? (Hint: Consider the countries that replaced GDP/capita with a happiness index. Do these countries perform well in terms of GDP per capita?

4) I like your idea of the 'Mental Mentors App' (although I'm not sure if the name of the app is sufficiently 'cool'). Have you considered the demand side? (Why would anyone use (voluntarily) your app rather than seek professional treatment immediately? Who would be willing to pay for it? Individuals? Schools? Firms?)

The name of the Opponent:

Marek Hudík

The employer of the Opponent:

FPH VŠE

Date August 28, 2019

Signature of the Opponent:
