MASTER´S EXAMINER REPORT

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

Thesis title:	**Repercussions of Human Rights Violations in International Migration of Latin America, case study: Mexico as a migration corridor**
Name of Student:	**Juan Manuel Cerezo Samperio**
Referee *(incl. titles)*:	**Mgr. Jaroslav Bílek, Ph.D.**
Report Due Date:	**10.09.2024**

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

1) Contribution and argument:
2) Theoretical and methodological framework:
3) Sources and literature:
4) Manuscript form and structure:
5) Quality of presentation

Given the form of the work, my comment will be general. First, I would like to highlight the choice of the topic, which I consider highly relevant to both world politics and the program the student attended.
Second, I would like to highlight the sources and literature the student used. I am only slightly surprised that most of them are in English. Latin American academics devote a lot of space to the subject of migration in their local journals.
A significant weakness of the work, however, is something else. Although the author has chosen a very relevant topic, its realization falls far short of expectations. Even though the author seemed to make a heartfelt effort to deal with the topic, it was not in his power.
In layman's terms, the thesis is chasing too many rabbits simultaneously. If I counted correctly, at least six objectives of the work are mentioned or implied in the introduction and on page 6. However, even one of each of them would, in my opinion, be reasonably sufficient for one master's thesis.
Unfortunately, neither of these objectives is sufficiently addressed in the thesis itself. Instead, the author proposes policy recommendations, which are commendable but misses the point of the thesis. Because the thesis attempts to address so many questions in such a small space, the results are often purely descriptive, and it is not very clear what original research led the author to these findings.
Besides this, the author's introduction promises quantitative data analysis and qualitative case studies, but I did not find any of these in the work.

CATEGORY		**POINTS**
Contribution (research quality, analysis, and conclusions)	*(max. 40 points)*	20
Theoretical and methodological framework	*(max. 25 points)*	10
Sources and literature	*(max. 10 points)*	10
Manuscript form and structure	*(max. 15 points)*	10
Quality of presentation (grammar, style, coherence)	*(max. 10 points)*	10
TOTAL POINTS	*(max. 100 points)*	**60**
The proposed grade (A-B-C-D-E-F)		**E**

Suggested questions for the defence are:

I have no questions that could affect the outcome of the defense.

I recommend the thesis for final defence.

Mgr. Jaroslav Bílek, Ph.D.

Digitálně podepsal Mgr. Jaroslav Bílek, Ph.D.
Datum: 2024.09.11 10:26:18 +02'00'

Referee Signature

Overall grading scheme at FSV UK:

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