

# Review of Master work reviewer

|                                  |                                                       |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| Name and Surname of Student      | Nathan BEGOC                                          |
| Qualification Work Title         | The Euroregion Erzgebirge-Krusnohori                  |
| Name and Type of Study Programme | Regional and European Project Management / Navazující |
| Faculty / Department             | Ekonomická fakulta / KRM                              |
| Supervisor                       | Ulbert Jörg, Dr.                                      |
| Reviewer                         | prof. Dr. Doris Fetscher                              |

## Thesis evaluation

1. Importance and difficulty of the topic 2.0

**Note:** To understand the development of such a specific Euro-Region is of great interest. There isn't a lot of literature or research on this specific region.

2. Logical structure of the thesis 2.5

**Note:** The different steps are logic. Basic notions as Euro-Region are well explained. The introduction is failed and not written in a scientific style.

3. Fulfillment of objectives 2.5

**Note:** The thesis is descriptiv. There are no hypothesis which can be verified. The author gives a good description of the Euro-Region. What means "from outside"? This is not clear.

4. Methodological approach 2.5

**Note:** I miss the methodological framework which explains the different steps at the beginning. The different steps: Historical, structural overview etc... are relevant steps to describe the project. He does not really cite from the interview

5. Assessment of theoretical and/or practical contribution of the thesis 2.0

**Note:** The thesis gives a good inside view in the structure and function of this specific Euro-Region

6. Handling of literature 1.5

**Note:** The citations and the bibliography are correct.

7. Formal aspects 2.0

**Note:** There are a lot of mistakes in the English summary. The style and the formal apparatus seem to be correct.

## Conclusion

Thesis evaluation (note): **very good**

I recommend the thesis for defence: **YES**

## Questions and comments

### Critical comments and overall contributions, total value of the thesis

Les différents pas d'analyse effectués par l'auteur sont logiques. C'est dommage qu'il n'ait pas réussi à donner un cadre méthodologique à son travail. Il s'agit en effet d'une étude de cas. Sous cette perspective, l'analyse de documents, de littérature, des observations et des interviews peuvent être intégrées méthodologiquement.

Il me manquent également des indications exactes où se trouvent les énoncés cités dans le matériel empirique.

Les commentaires sur l'utilisation des langues auraient du être mis en bas de page.

### **Questions and topics for discussion before the commission**

Vous avez écrit que vous voudriez analyser cette Euro-Région de l'extérieur. Qu'est-ce que cela veut dire?

Date: Sep 17, 2018

Signature of reviewer