

# MASTER'S EXAMINER REPORT

*GPS – Geopolitical Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University*

|                                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <b>Thesis title:</b>           | Food Security in East Asia in the Present and Near-Future |
| <b>Name of Student:</b>        | Eric Scholz   |
| <b>Referee (incl. titles):</b> | Bohumil Doboš   |
| <b>Report Due Date:</b>        | 20.8.2024   |

**Comments of the referee on the thesis highlights and shortcomings (following the four numbered aspects of your assessment indicated below).**

**1) Contribution and argument:** The paper aims to develop a study covering a very interesting and often overlooked aspect of global politics – food security and its impact on the geopolitical situation of the countries of East Asia. The contribution is, however, problematic. As will be highlighted below, the text is lacking clear methodology. Its connection to geopolitics is almost missing. Additionally, the paper is providing insufficient analytical contribution, being more of a descriptive overview of certain aspects of food production and availability. Nonetheless, the chapters are providing useful insights into the situation in the four selected countries (ROC, PRC, Japan, South Korea) based on large number of sources and data gathered. It thus gives the reader some value, yet is missing some aspects required from an academic work.

**2) Theoretical and methodological framework:** The text suffers from unclear operationalization of food security and connected issue of an unclear approach of how the food security is being measured. The text is in the end not providing comparative study but four stand-alone descriptive chapters. This is tied to the methodological issue as well as lacking chapter that would develop such a comparison. The thesis is lacking theory, further taking the text away from a desirable academic output.

**3) Sources and literature:** The amount and quality of used sources is sufficient, there is no issue with citations and bibliography.

**4) Manuscript form and structure:** Formatting is by the beginning not unified. Pictures and maps should have been more explicitly tied to the text. Otherwise, the form and structure is good and logical.

**5) Quality of presentation:** The text sometimes uses informal language. Other than that, there are no issues with the quality of the presentation.

| CATEGORY   | POINTS     |
|--|------------|
| <i>Contribution (research quality, analysis, and conclusions) (max. 40 points)</i> | 18         |
| <i>Theoretical and methodological framework (max. 25 points)</i>                   | 10         |
| <i>Sources and literature (max. 10 points)</i>                                     | 10         |
| <i>Manuscript form and structure (max. 15 points)</i>                              | 14         |
| <i>Quality of presentation (grammar, style, coherence) (max. 10 points)</i>        | 8          |
| <b>TOTAL POINTS (max. 100 points)</b>  | <b>60</b>  |
| <b>The proposed grade (A-B-C-D-E-F)</b>  | <b>D-E</b> |

**Suggested questions for the defence are:**

**I recommend the thesis for final defence.**

---

**Referee Signature**

*Overall grading scheme at FSV UK:*

| TOTAL POINTS | GRADE    | Quality standard                                      |
|--------------|----------|---|
| 91 – 100     | <b>A</b> | = outstanding (high honor)                            |
| 81 – 90      | <b>B</b> | = superior (honor)                                    |
| 71 – 80      | <b>C</b> | = good  |
| 61 – 70      | <b>D</b> | = satisfactory  |
| 51 – 60      | <b>E</b> | = low pass at a margin of failure                     |
| 0 – 50       | <b>F</b> | = failing. The thesis is not recommended for defence. |