

## REFEREE'S REVIEW

<b>Program:</b>	MIB
<b>Student:</b>	Anatolii Sokolov
<b>Title of thesis:</b>	Collaboration as a tool of supply chain risk management

<b>Justification of the topic choice. Accuracy in defining the aim and objectives of the thesis.</b> Justification of the topic choice; accuracy in defining the aim and tasks of the thesis; originality of the topic and the extent to which it was covered; alignment of the thesis' topic, aim and objectives.	5	4	3	2
<b>Structure and logic of the text flow.</b> Logic of research; full scope of the thesis; alignment of thesis' structural parts, i.e. theoretical and empirical parts.	5	4	3	2
<b>Quality of analytical approach and quality of offered solution to the research objectives.</b> Adequacy of objectives coverage; ability to formulate and convey the research problem; ability to offer options for its solution; application of the latest trends in relevant research are for the set objectives.	5	4	3	2
<b>Quality of data gathering and description.</b> Quality of selecting research tools and methods; data validity adequacy; adequacy of used data for chosen research tools and methods; completeness and relevance of the list of references.	5	4	3	2
<b>Scientific aspect of the thesis.</b> Independent scientific thinking in solving the set problem/objectives; the extent to which the student contributed to selecting and justifying the research model (conceptual and/or quantitative), developing methodology/approach to set objectives.	5	4	3	2
<b>Practical/applied nature of research.</b> Extent to which the theoretical background is related to the international or Russian managerial practice; development of applied recommendations; justification and interpretation of the empirical/applied results.	5	4	3	2
<b>Quality of thesis layout.</b> Layout fulfils the requirements of the Regulations for master thesis preparation and defense, correct layout of tables, figures, references.	5	4	3	2

Each item above is evaluated on the following scale, as applicable: 5 = excellent, 4 = good, 3 = satisfactory, 2 = poor

### Additional comments:

Author has decided to concentrate on the theoretical part with the low focus on the practical side of the study, which are both strong and weak features of the thesis. The theory is elaborated very well, while there is almost no evidence of the chance to use the result in the real life situation.

Only one case company – Henkel – is taken for the analysis. This is possible (single case study based scientific paper) only if the case is deeply analysed and investigated in many details. This opportunity is not explored – author avoids in-depth view and only describe the methodology and results.

Based on this single-case deficiency, conclusion looks not as valid as if it would be justified via more broad investigation.

Despite comments above, author has made a sufficient effort and prepared a good paper.

Master thesis of Anatolii Sokolov meets the requirements of MIB program, and deserves a good grade, thus the author can be given the desired degree.

Andrei Panibratov  
Professor  
June 16, 2013

