

Opposition: Gabriela Franklinová

Author of the project: Tomáš Hudeček

Here I want to focus on things I consider insufficient or which I would like to edit:

1. **Abstract:** First thing I have noticed right away was the insufficient length of the abstract, which is written very briefly and does not meet the minimum of 1800 characters. In my opinion this is a pity because I can imagine, that even though the author wanted to briefly introduce the topic, he missed the points that were required to appear in the abstract. I would definitely welcome some information about why the author chose this topic in the first place, maybe some brief introduction into the context of the topic which this work will discuss, why the author decided to deal with this topic, etc.

Next point, which I am missing, is a detailed description of methods used in this project. What kind of research is this topic based on? Is it a compilation work? This can be assumed only from one sentence: "by compiling all the relevant information.." but it does not introduce us any other details. I would maybe include a more detailed description of the literature to be used in this research. Author says that he will be using historic books. What kind of books? Are they focused mainly on the history of Chongqing? Or on the history of China as a whole? I think this information is important, because as we know, books focused on specific topics give more details rather than books focused on a wider spectrum of information, giving us only a brief information on the topic. Something similar author mentions in the last paragraph of the Advancement in Research.

I would also include an information on what will the readers find in this research, what kind of information. For example, will we find an information about Chongqing's geographic strategic position? Information about its citizens? Information about the economy? I feel like including this information would greatly expand the abstract and would certainly help readers to imagine in detail what are they going to read about.

2. **Advancement in Research:** Another thing I have noticed is a very lengthy description of the literature, which includes the full information about the author, name of the publication and its year. I personally feel like mentioning the authors name and a year of his publication would be enough. After all, there is a specific place to cite all the needed information in the Quoted literature section. Instead I would rather focus on the literature itself, what is it about, what did the author find out and how is this information relevant to my research? For example, the work of Stephen Pow (2017) (by the way, at first I thought that the author forgot to include this work in the Quoted literature section, then I have noticed that it is right at the top of the list, which does not correspond to the alphabetical order. Just a detail, but still a mistake to me..). What information is available in this work about Chongqing and how is the author going to use it in his research? Same with other mentioned literature.

Another point I am missing in this section is a mention of some specific benefits of this work. Whom will this work benefit? How will this research be interesting for people who do not deal directly with this specific topic?

3. **Research method:** what I was missing the most in this part of the research was some detailed explanation of what kind of information is the author seeking in the used literature and how will he use this information. Author mentions researching since the ancient times up until the modern era. In my opinion this timeline contains way too much information. How is the author

going to decide, which information is needed for his topic? Based on what? How will he sort out all the relevant information? And based on what information is he going to find all the answers to his questions? How is the author going to find exactly that “one point in history where this was the case”? What I am missing is some particular focus on what the author is looking for. Even though he mentions in this part, that he will focus “on points in history which significantly affected the city’s strategic importance”, I would mention maybe some examples. Is it going to be the number of militaries in the town? Geographic position? Number of successful defenses? I would be interested in more detailed explanation of this information.

I would also include some brief context on how can we consider Chongqing to be “one of the most strategically important areas in China”? Again, in the second part of the research author focuses on a very wide timeline from the ancient times up until the modern era. Again, I find this timeline to be containing lots of information, therefore I would welcome some detailed explanation of how the author is going to find all the information needed.

I feel like a detailed methodology used to exert all this information should be included as well. Deduction? Probe method? In the second part of the research author wants to focus on factors (?) which make Chongqing strategically important area. Will he focus on all the information concerning this topic? Or is he looking for some concrete factors? Based on what did he chose these factors?

4. **Formal mistakes:** - I do not know if it is a huge mistake, but to me it feels like a formal one and that is the mistake of formatting. I personally would have divided the sentences into paragraphs (Tab), and I would align the text to the edges of the page.
- Grammar – author used very long and therefore complicated sentences that if, in my opinion, would be shorter, this paper would be even easier to read.
in the Research method section there is a sentence just like this, but I assume the author forgot to end the sentence and instead wrote a coma: „I will consider this question answered upon finding one point in history where this was the case, however to consider my entire primary goal achieved, my requirement is finding at least two examples of such, That’s because calling Chongqing the bastion of China because of one instance is somewhat unfounded and could be argued to be a coincidence of a sort, but I feel like two solid examples already show a pattern, especially since there are few instances of an outside power conquering or even just pushing China to the brink.“
 - Also in this part there is a sentence: “The scale of this obviously seems immense, and so I will only focus only on points in history which significantly affected the city’s strategic importance and make sort of an overview, as opposed to evaluating all of Chongqing’s advantages and/or disadvantages at each period.” (There should be only one ,only’)
 - Quoted literature – there should be a space between a colon from both sides, even in the name of the literature. Some of the citations are written correctly though.

DANIELSON, Eric N. *China's Hidden Fortress : The Chongqing Fishing City, Volume I (Chinese City Walls & Forts)*. USA, California, Scotts Valley : CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, April 2018. ISBN-10 198112358X/ISBN-13 978-1981123582.

- In the Advancement research section, I think names of the literature used should be written in italics..

Overall, I find this topic very interesting, namely because, as author says, it is a first of its kind and he is also describing something that was not researched until now. I think that this research project proposal could have been wrote in a better way, including more detailed information and something, that would show authors knowledge of this topic and the information regarding this topic. I must highlight the authors effort to write this research in English, which I personally feel like is going to take a lot of hard work.