CZECH UNIVERSITY OF LIFE SCIENCES PRAGUE

Faculty of Economics and Management

Evaluation of the Diploma Thesis by supervisor

Thesis Title	**Approaches to common stock valuation**
Name of the student	**Tarlan Aliyev, BA**
Thesis supervisor	**Ing. Pavel Srbek, Ph.D.**
Department	**Department of Economic Theories**

Formulation of objectives	1	2	3	**4**
Choice of appropriate methods and methodology used	1	2	3	**4**
Logical process being used, work with data and information	1	2	3	**4**
Theoretical background of an author	1	**2**	3	4
The structure of paragraphs and chapters	1	**2**	3	4
Work with scientific literature (quotations, norms)	1	**2**	3	4
Comprehensibility of the text and level of language	1	2	**3**	4
Clarity and professionalism of expression in the work	1	2	**3**	4
Formal presentation of the work, the overall impression	1	2	**3**	4
Fulfillment of objectives	1	2	3	**4**
Formulation of conclusions	1	2	3	**4**
Professional contribution of the work and its practical usage	1	2	**3**	4
Summary and key-words comply with the content the thesis	1	**2**	3	4
Author's stance and approach to the addressed problems	1	2	**3**	4
Author's co-operation with supervisor and department	1	2	3	**4**

Evaluation of the work by grade (1, 2, 3, 4) **4**

Evaluation: 1 = the best

Date 15/04/2021

.....

Supervisor signature

Other comments or suggestions:

There is a number of formal issues – the Assignment is missing in the thesis, chapter numbering does not follow recommended template, typing errors.

Presented thesis is quite controversial. On one hand, it seems the author proved that he understands the matter as he uses profesional expressions and explains relations among variables properly, on the other hand, the practical section looks like a huge shortcut as the author could not wait to reach the concluding chapter. Hence, the core problem (and also both intended as well as proposed objective)- the comparison of valuation techniques – is not adressed at all in my point of view.

Literature review presents relevant conceptual framework. There are no serious problems with referencing standards. It must be appreciated that the author used scientific papers extensively.

Chapter 2 could be acounted to the practical section as it provides overview of the market situation in historical perspective.

I haven't found why right the period 2014-19 is used. It is not explained in methodology section or elswhere. The author just states period long enough is needed for fundamental analysis. But, does this period cover the entire business cycle? Isn't it an exceptional period?

The fundamental part of this thesis- application and comparison of valuation models – is one huge shortcut. It just takes models as defined in theoretical section and applies them. Thre is no discussion provided on the choice of relevant inputs. For example the first model – average anual return – the author correctly emphasizes that use of arithmetic average is questionable, however, where the author's finding, that the return "in 2019 will be approximately in the 8-10% range", comes from, is not specified. The range is based on some kind of untold probability distribution? The next model, DCF, is described by a single sentence, the other one reffers to a formula that haven't been explained in neither in literature reviw norin methodology section. The same it is with all other presented techniques.

This thesis would be an ucceptable bachelor thesis, however, it cannot be defended as a master thesis. It needs more time and author's attention to mature. Length of this does not reach the requirement specified in the Assignment.

Plagiarism control: The system Theses.cz has not assessed the thesis as suspicious.

Date 15/04/2021

.....

Supervisor signature