

## REVIEW

by **research supervisor** of the graduate qualification paper submitted by the second-year student of the Strategic and Arms Control Studies master's program at SPbSU

**Ganeeva Aliya**

(first name, last name of the student)

titled **The nuclear weapons factor in South Korean public opinion**

(title)

### 1. Assessment of the paper:

No.	Assessment Criteria (codes of competences according to curriculum)	Grade: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• excellent, A (5.0)</li> <li>• good, B (4.5)</li> <li>• good, C (4.0)</li> <li>• satisfactory, D (3.5)</li> <li>• satisfactory, E (3.0)</li> <li>• unsatisfactory, F (0.0)<sup>1</sup></li> </ul>	Reviewer's Comments (mandatory for those criteria on which the paper is assessed critically or downgraded)
1.	<b>Academic relevance of the research problem</b> (ОПК-4, ПКА-5)	A	
2.	<b>Scholarly contribution by the author</b> (ОПК-4, ПКА-2, ПКА-3, ПКА-5, ПКА-6, ПКП-9)	B	An interesting analysis and important assumptions were made by the author, but the study lacks precision and concentration on the main question, so it is difficult to evaluate the general value of the conclusions
3.	<b>Appropriateness of the research objective, coherence of research objective and research tasks</b> (ОПК-4, ПКА-2, ПКА-5, ПКА-6, ПКА-10, ПКП-9)	D	The research question, subject, mission etc., as they are formulated in the Introduction, make it difficult to understand what the thesis is about.
4.	<b>Quality of the empirical scope and of the primary sources review</b> (ПКА-2, ПКА-7, ПКП-4)	D	The short list of the primary sources is quite short, and the Introduction does not contain a good analysis of the primary sources. It is not clear, why only governmental documents are mentioned as primary sources while the paper is about public opinion.
5.	<b>Comprehensiveness of secondary sources (academic literature) employed by the author</b> (ПКА-2, ПКА-7)	B	The list of the academic literature used by the author is quite impressive, but there is no analysis of this literature in the Introduction
6.	<b>Adequacy of chosen research methods to the stated research objective and research tasks</b> (ПКА-2, ПКА-8, ПКА-10)	B	The methods of a study of public opinion are not specified.
7.	<b>Correspondence of empirical results to the stated research objective and research tasks</b> (ОПК-7, ПКА-2, ПКА-3, ПКА-5, ПКА-6, ПКП-4, ПКП-9)	A	

<sup>1</sup> If the paper is assessed as “unsatisfactory” based on one of the criteria, the overall recommended grade for the paper is to be “unsatisfactory”, in which case a reviewer presents his/her detailed arguments in the Comments section as well as in the Conclusion/Recommendations section.

8.	<b>Text formatting and editing</b> (ОПК-7, ПКА-7)	A	
9.	<b>Diligence, consistency, and responsibility demonstrated by the student when writing the paper</b> (ОПК-7, УК-6)	B	
<b>Average grade:</b>		4,4	

**2. Conclusion/Recommendations for the evaluation commission:** Generally, the paper presented a very good overview of contemporary public opinion in South Korea.

**3. Recommended grade (in ECTS): Good (B)**

*Date 11.06.22*



A.Pavlov, professor, SPBU.

*Title, name and signature of research supervisor*