Faculty of Business and Economics

Supervisor review

Department:	Department of statistics and operational research
Author:	Bc. Barbora Jiřikovská
Title:	Sales of natural fresh milk in the Czech Republic via vending machines
Supervisor:	Doc. Ing. Václav Adamec, Ph.D.

Part I – Basic requirements for master thesis

Instructions:

1. The first part of the review concentrates on critical parts of master thesis that are required to recommend the thesis to be defended. These aspects could be evaluated only by answers yes-no.
2. If at least one aspect is evaluated in the negative way, the thesis may not be recommended for defense. The reasons for the negative decisions should be specified and the second part of the review does not have to be completed.

1. Does the thesis contain objective defined correctly and does the objective correspond to the common requirements for the master thesis?	YES
2. Is the review of literature including the citations and references elaborated correctly from the methodological and formal point of view?	NO
3. Does the thesis include precise description of used methods and are these methods suitable for defined objective?	NO
4. Does the thesis covers the clear conclusions, reasoned recommendations, justified suggestions, etc. that bring new knowledge or information?	YES

Reasons for negative answers, specification of missing or unsatisfactory parts:

The author of this thesis appeared in my office on Monday April 18, 2011, i.e. 40 days before deadline for thesis submission, informing me that now she is ready to begin analyzing her extensive data and working on her master´s thesis. Quality of the diploma thesis, she has submitted to the examining committee in fulfillment of the requirements for MSc. degree, corresponds to the extraordinary speed, she must have been working to meet the deadline. As thesis advisor, I did not have the opportunity to proof-read the manuscript before printing and binding.

Primarily, the literature review has been negatively affected:
- The list of cited literature is incomplete. Authors Gajdůšek (2003) and Maddala (1988) are missing.
- The list of cited literature was not prepared using a unified standard and it is not arranged in alphabetic order, as required.
- Incorrect abbreviation "and col." is widely used in this thesis instead of the correct "et al."
- Numerous citations were done in an incorrect or incomplete manner with publication year incorrect or missing or additional co-authors missing. A total of 12 occurrences of mistaken references were found in the text.

There is an overwhelming number of spelling or grammar errors in the text. Figures and tables are not referenced in the text.

Cluster analysis is definitely not suitable for breakpoint detection and identification of homogenous segments in univariate seasonal time series. Chow test, SupF test or graphical procedures should be applied instead. It is evident to the reader that milk sales time series segmentations published in this thesis are actually unsupported by output from any legitimate quantitative method, test or analysis.

It is my oppinion that author of this thesis be given another opportunity to redo her thesis.

Part II – Quality of master thesis

Instructions:

1. The second part of the review regards with quality evaluation of selected aspect of the thesis. The thesis could obtain 0-60 points in total. Zero points correspond to thesis meeting only the minimal requirements, while thesis evaluated by 60 points is excellent and inventive in all evaluated aspects.
2. The evaluation scale has five levels:

    accomplished, at the level of minimum of requirements given in part I (0 points)

    accomplished with significant but not critical imperfections (2 points)

    accomplished, the imperfections do not influence the merit of the thesis and mainly the results (5 points)

    accomplished fully without any reservations and in the exhausting way (8 points)

    excellent, extraordinary, originative and completely correct accomplishment (10 points)
3. Points assigned in evaluation of individual aspect have to be briefly justified; the extraordinary solutions have to be considered.

5.	Contribution, originality, demandingness of the thesis	Points: 0

(frequency of the issue, non-existence of conventional solution, unavailability of solution for researched conditions, expected and real contribution of the thesis, extent of the specific knowledge needed to meet the objective, …)

6.	Quality of the review of the literature	Points: 0

(extent of surveyed literature and its up-to-dateness and representativeness, use of foreign and cardinal sources, suitability of survey for own research,, discussion of alternative approaches, analysis of citations and references, synthesis of theoretical knowledge for own research,…)

7.	Methodology and its application	Points: 0

(discussion of suitability of chosen method, comparison of alternative attitudes, possibility to verify the results, correctness of application of methods, suitability of data samples used, preventing errors and shortages of applied methods, comparison of results, variations reasoning, …)

8.	Own research	Points: 0

(depth and complexity of performed analysis, extent of use of knowledge from literature review, proving facts, suitability of samples and sources used, treatment of data errors, level of meeting the thesis objective, hypotheses answering, …)

9.	Conclusions and recommendations	Points: 0

(correctness of conclusions, explicit formulations, adequacy of suggestions, generalizing conclusions, applicability of recommendations, …)

10.	Logical framework, formal requirements	Points: 0

(correct structure, logical coherence of text, correctness of terminology, explicitness and clarity of graphics, accurateness of language, …)

Part III – Summary and final evaluation

Instructions:

1. After summarizing the points the reviewer marks with a cross the appropriate final evaluation according to corresponding interval of points.
2. The clear final decision has to be stated in the conclusion. The thesis can be recommended to be defended only in the case, when there is no negative evaluation in the part I of this review.
3. In the following part the reviewer has the opportunity to give his/her opinion to thesis as a whole and give further suggestions and comments.

Total points: 0 points

Final evaluation:

	0–12 points	accomplished at the level of minimum of requirements given in part I
	13–24 points	accomplished with significant but not critical imperfections
	25–36 points	accomplished, the imperfections do not influence the merit of the thesis and mainly the results
	37–48 points	accomplished fully without any reservations and in the exhausting way
	49–60 points	excellent, extraordinary, originative and completely correct accomplishment

Final decision: **I DO NOT RECOMMEND**   thesis to be defended.

Further comments and suggestions the author should discuss within the defense of the thesis:

Date: June 8, 2011

Name and signature of the supervisor: Doc. Ing. Václav Adamec, Ph.D.

Date: June 10, 2011

Name and signature of the head of the department: Ing. Mgr. Jitka Janová, Ph.D.