

BACHELOR THESIS REVIEW

Type of review: *thesis supervisor*

Author: *Dana Alsaialy*

Title: *“Beyond pure health”: Exploring diagnostic pathways, quasi-medicalization, and patient expertise in dermatology*

Supervisor: *Dino Numerato*

Reviewer: *Barbora Benešová*

Please explain the reasons for your evaluation (especially reservations and criticisms) according to the criteria listed below.

1. Is the aim of the thesis (research question) clearly stated and do the conclusions correspond to it? Is the thesis appropriately structured?

Comments:

The aim of the thesis is clearly stated and addressed mainly in the empirical sections, discussion and conclusions. The thesis is appropriately structured.

2. Is the thesis based on relevant research and literature and does it accurately summarize and integrate the information?

Comments:

The thesis is based on the extensive volume of literature. The robust literature review allows Dana Alsaialy to capture the complexity of the analysed phenomenon from different perspectives. Overall, the number of references for an undergraduate thesis is impressive. However, at some points, the effort to discuss everything risks becoming counter-productive; not all points are discussed in sufficient depth. Moreover, the literature would benefit from a more straightforward line of argumentation.

3. What is the quality of the data or the other sources? Are the sample method, data collection and data analysis appropriate?

Comments:

The sampling includes 12 respondents, including participants from nine different contexts. The process of coding is transparent and well developed and the analytical parts provide a number of laudable observations. The sections on approaches to dermatological concerns and on the social construction of these concerns are very strong.

On a minor note, I would recommend developing further the interpretation around Figure 6, which, in general, provides a nice synthesis of previous sections. I would consider presenting Figure 7 in a

self-standing part. Moreover, when it comes to the sampling, only specific dermatological concerns are discussed in the thesis. This point could have been better stressed, for example in the final discussion, considering that patients with severe dermatological diseases are not included in the sample.

4. Are the findings relevant to the research question? Are the conclusions of the thesis based on strong arguments?

Comments:

The argumentation is appropriate, and the conclusions are based on strong arguments.

5. Are the author's thoughts distinguished unambiguously from the borrowed ideas?

Comments:

Yes.

6. What is the quality of style and other formal requirements?

Comments:

The quality of style is high; the thesis is very well written and adheres to the formal requirements for an undergraduate thesis.

7. Are there any other strengths and weaknesses of the thesis, which are not included in the previous questions? Please list them if any.

-

8. What topic do you suggest for the discussion in the thesis defence?

Considering the following observation: "Regarding methodology, adopting a multi-step approach to data collection, such as supplementing interviews with (virtual) observations", (p. 48) could you please specify what could be specifically meant by virtual observations and type of data could be included?

9. I declare that I have checked the result of the originality check of the thesis:

Theses Turnitin Ouriginal (Urkund)

Comment on the result of the check: *OK*

Overall evaluation of the thesis:

I am happy to conclude that the thesis is above the standard of undergraduate theses and it provides a valuable contribution. Although I made several critical points, I view them as minor shortcomings and I recommend the thesis for defence with a proposed grade A.

Proposed grade: (A - F)

Date: 13 June 2024

Signature: