

# CZECH UNIVERSITY OF LIFE SCIENCES PRAGUE

Faculty of Tropical AgriSciences

## Evaluation of the Diploma Thesis by Opponent

Thesis Title **Consumers' Attitudes Towards Functional Food in Turkey**

Name of the student **Bc. Ismail Burak Karademir**

Thesis supervisor **Ing. Petra Chaloupková, Ph.D., dr. h. c.**

Department **Department of Economics and Development**

Opponent **Ing. Pavel Nový, Ph.D.**

Formulation of the aims	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Choice of suitable methods	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Fulfilment of the aims	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Scientific contribution of the thesis	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Originality of the thesis	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Theoretical background of the author	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Handling with data and information	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Handling with scientific literature (citations)	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Argumentation and critical thinking	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4
Abstract and keywords	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Structure of the chapters and paragraphs	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Comprehensibility of the text	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4
Accuracy of the terminology	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Quality of scientific language	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Formatting, layout and general impression	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Evaluation of the work by grade (1, 2, 3, 4)	<b>3</b>			

Evaluation: 1 = the best

Date 06/09/2021

Signature of Opponent

**Other comments or suggestions:**

The thesis brings an interesting topic of consumers awareness and attitudes towards functional foods. The topic is not easy since there is not a clear consensus in the functional food definition. The author of this thesis also failed to shed more light on the problematics in the literature part. A proper definition of the term is missing also in the methodology which can lead to bias results and interpretations. The text contains also many grammatical errors with confusing formulations. However, despite numerous drawbacks, I evaluate the work as good.

I have the following comments:

The chapters in the literature review are structured logically but their content seems rather without any concept.

When describing current market situation of functional food, the author is most frequently using references published 10 years ago and earlier, even in 1986...

The classification of functional food is not described correctly, or at least not clearly. I am also missing proper examples and explanations in case of functional food categories.

EFSA has been omitted completely in the list of authorities approving health claims.

Poor grammar sometimes leads to misleading, confusing or hard to understand formulations, some sentences have no sense at all, other ones are out of context.

Sugar, cholesterol, and blood pressure are not diseases.

It would be nice to give an understandable explanation to the results presented in the tables 3 and 4.

The survey was conducted in Istanbul; however, the author is generalizing the results for all Turkish consumers, which is misleading.

There is inconsistent formatting in the list of references and incorrect use of citations in the text.

Abbreviations should be defined also in the first appearance in the text, not only in the list of abbreviations.

**Questions for thesis defence:**

1. What were the inclusion criteria for the selection of functional foods presented in the figure 1? Onion and garlic are included but no other vegetables and fruits. Why? What about nuts and what about non-dairy fermented foods?

2. Could you provide us clear explanation of the results presented in the tables 3 and 4?

3. You are mentioning insulin as one of the main prebiotics. Can you tell us more about its function in the human body?

Date 06/09/2021

.....  
Signature of Opponent