

# Report on Bachelor / Master Thesis

Institute of Economic Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

<b>Student:</b>	doc. PhDr. Zuzana Havránková, Ph.D.
<b>Advisor:</b>	Kateřina Kozlíková
<b>Title of the thesis:</b>	Price elasticities of meat, fish and seafood: A meta-analysis

## **OVERALL ASSESSMENT** (provided in English, Czech, or Slovak):

**Short summary:** The author follows the newest methodology for meta-analysis and study the effect of price elasticities of meat, fish and seafood. I find the topic studied novel and the findings of the thesis interesting. On the other hand, I understand international significance of the topic, but I am not sure about the contribution of the topic in the Czech area, where we have no sea.

**Contribution:** As author acknowledges there are already written several meta-analyses regarding seafood, for example, Gallet (2009) and Gallet (2010). So the merit of this thesis is rather methodological. Besides, author finds that for Hicksian meat elasticities, there is evidence that the price elasticity of demand for beef is more elastic compared to other meat types. For fish and seafood, she detects disparities between high and low-income households.

**Methods:** The author used the state-of-art method for meta-analysis. She analyzes the publication bias via graphical and formal tests. She includes even the modern non-parametrical methods in search for the true effect. Then the heterogeneity is scrutinized by BMA and FMA. I think everything is done perfectly, I am just concerned (and it is a very big concern) about the size of the sample. The publication bias estimates are based on samples from 62 to 202 observations, the BMA and FMA estimates are on the samples of 292 (Marshallian) and 164 (Hicksian) observations. I was strictly taught to built meta-analyses on at least 300 observations from 30 articles, and, for example, my bachelor thesis had about 3,524 observations from 42 articles. So when I see such a small samples (below 200 observations), I compare the time I spend with the data, it is not just about the number of rows in excel that one has to fill, but it is about the number of control variables you can include in the smaller sample to have sufficient degrees of freedom. And I wonder about the stability of the given results, treatment of outliers etc. It is written that 1% winsorization was used, but I am not sure, whether on the whole sample, or at each subsample. 1% from 62 observation is mentioned as 1 outlier? And what if there are two of them? Does it shift the results completely, or not? I had the similar comments, for example, to the work of Daniel Bartušek in 2021.

**Literature:** Author cites all relevant literature with respect to the topic and given methodology.

**Manuscript form:** I found the manuscript typed very precisely.

## **Overall evaluation and suggested questions for the discussion during the defense**

Based on my comments above I have several questions for the defence:

1. The data sample consists of several subsamples, that you test separately. What is the minimal number of observations for conducting a meta-analysis?
2. How did you treat the outliers? Did you treat them together for whole sample (i.e. some of the subsamples are not winsorized), or did you do it for each subsample alone? How many observation did you actually winsorize for each sample?
3. Are you not afraid about stability of you results?

From my perspective, the thesis fulfills the requirements for a bachelor thesis at IES, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University, I recommend it for the defense and suggest a grade B. Besides the results of the Urkund analysis do not indicate significant text similarity with other available sources.

# Report on Bachelor / Master Thesis

Institute of Economic Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

<b>Student:</b>	doc. PhDr. Zuzana Havránková, Ph.D.
<b>Advisor:</b>	Kateřina Kozlíková
<b>Title of the thesis:</b>	Price elasticities of meat, fish and seafood: A meta-analysis

**SUMMARY OF POINTS AWARDED** (for details, see below):

<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
<i>Contribution</i> (max. 30 points)	25
<i>Methods</i> (max. 30 points)	20
<i>Literature</i> (max. 20 points)	20
<i>Manuscript Form</i> (max. 20 points)	20
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b> (max. 100 points)	<b>85</b>
<b>GRADE</b> (A – B – C – D – E – F)	<b>B</b>

**NAME OF THE REFEREE:** Josef Bajzík

**DATE OF EVALUATION:** 21. 8. 2024

Digitálně podepsáno (21. 8. 2024)  
Josef Bajzík

---

**Referee Signature**

**EXPLANATION OF CATEGORIES AND SCALE:**

**CONTRIBUTION:** *The author presents original ideas on the topic demonstrating critical thinking and ability to draw conclusions based on the knowledge of relevant theory and empirics. There is a distinct value added of the thesis.*

**METHODS:** *The tools used are relevant to the research question being investigated, and adequate to the author's level of studies. The thesis topic is comprehensively analyzed.*

**LITERATURE REVIEW:** *The thesis demonstrates author's full understanding and command of recent literature. The author quotes relevant literature in a proper way.*

**MANUSCRIPT FORM:** *The thesis is well structured. The student uses appropriate language and style, including academic format for graphs and tables. The text effectively refers to graphs and tables and disposes with a complete bibliography.*

**Overall grading:**

TOTAL	GRADE
91 – 100	A
81 - 90	B
71 - 80	C
61 – 70	D
51 – 60	E
0 – 50	F