**TRANSPORT ECONOMICS ARTÚR VELKEY, ÁDÁM VÍG**

Evaluation

Please evaluate the paper along the criteria listed! Please also note whether you recommend the paper to be accepted as a final paper for the course! You can find the assessment below the criteria. In addition, we would like to ask for your opinion on whether the paper has potential for further research!

**General overview of the paper:**

The authors use load factor and ticket price data from Spain’s high-speed trains to retrace the motivations behind its dynamic pricing system. More specifically, they identify price discrimination and smoothing of demand shocks as two possible objectives of dynamic pricing and study to what extent these objectives can describe the observed price changes. They find that smoothing demand dominates when more than five days remain until departure, but after this point price discrimination becomes the main driver of price increases.

The topic is certainly interesting and well worthy of study. The authors aptly identify two possible reasons for dynamic pricing and the data seems appropriate. But some of their conclusions are perhaps a bit bold in face of the evidence presented. One example of this is the authors’ claim that “load factor loses its importance” close to departure which seems to be derived from confusing the lack of proof for one claim with proof for its opposite; in this case the fact that no significant difference is seen between the frequency of price increases for filled-up and less filled-up trains, respectively, which should not be treated as proof that no such difference exists. Because of this, the paper’s main conclusion that the operator uses a different pricing strategy close to departure seems less than robust. In another somewhat bold claim, the authors write that price discrimination is only useful for profit maximizing but not for welfare maximizing purposes, which is not in all cases true.

In all, the paper is interesting and has the potential to be developed into something useful. But the authors should revisit parts of their argumentation and consider adjusting some of their conclusions.

**Evaluation criteria**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1.** | Relevance of the research question, its justification | **The research question is relevant and justified.** |
| **2.** | Relevance of literature | **Most of the cited literature is relevant** |
| **3.** | Review of the literature | **The literature review is reasonably well done** |
| **4.** | Relevance of the methods applied to examine the problem | **The quantitative analysis is relevant.** |
| **5.** | Application of the methods | **The methods seem sound. Some of the data might be easier to analyze if presented differently. For instance, fares increase more rapidly close to departure, possibly in line with a quicker pace of ticket sales, but this connection is not made.** |
| **6.** | Structure of the paper, line of thought | **The structure can be improved. Some information appears again and again with small differences. Analysis should not be made in ‘methods’ or ‘data’ sections.** |
| **7.** | Author’s inferences, own arguments, coherence | **This can also be improved, as discussed in the general overview.** |
| **8.** | Style of the paper | **The style of writing is in some cases too informal.** |
| **9.** | Suggestions for improvement | **See general overview.** |

We would like to ask you to provide an assessment based on the criteria above! The academic evaluation system of the college allows you to recommend one of the following assessments:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Recommendation** |  | **Description** |
| Not accepted |  | Papers containing plagiarism and/or not meeting the minimal requirements of a scientific paper on chosen topic are not accepted. |
| Accepted | unconditionally | The paper is logically consistent, reviewed literature is relevant, inferences and methods used are adequate. The author demonstrates ability to form own arguments. |
|  | with minor corrections | Minor corrections are needed for the paper to be accepted. The deadline to make these corrections is: 29 January |
|  | conditionally, has to be developed to meet TDK[[1]](#footnote-1) requirements | Conditional acceptance should apply to papers with more serious errors. In this case, the author should proceed with further research and submit his/her paper for the next evaluation in 3 months. The evaluation criteria in this case is identical to the Corvinus Scientific Student Conference evaluation criteria. |

**Recommendation: accepted with minor corrections. The authors should revisit their argumentation and adjust their conclusions accordingly. (See general overview.)**

**Future of the Paper**

Finally, we would like to ask for your opinion, whether the paper has a potential for further research, and if yes, what directions would you recommend?

The topic is interesting, but rather large improvements are required in the analysis made, the literature review, the framing of the question, and the paper’s structure and language.

Date REVIEWER

12th january

**Emanuel Broman, Swedish national road and transport research institute**

1. TDK is a *call for papers* conference for students, annually organized by Corvinus University of Budapest. The requirements are in general, to submit an academic paper in a given field and demonstrate high ability to conduct research. The evaluation criteria are as listed above, it is only differentiated in terms of length (min. 20 pages) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)