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Comments of the referee on the thesis highlights and shortcomings (following the 5 numbered aspects of your assessment indicated below).

1) **Theoretical background:** Discourse about migration has evolved profoundly during the year 2015. Author uses theory of securitization and discourse analysis to find answers to four questions about: 1) migration as a security issue; 2) evolution of the securitization of migration in 2015; 3) EU response to migration crisis; 4) development of the common migration policy in the light of securitization of migration. Ms. Martinez established in her hypothesis, that the discourse over migration has evolved from a humanitarian perspective to a securitization approach. The whole research is focused on Czech republic, Hungary and Germany and the research structure is very clear and well constructed.

2) **Contribution:** The main objective was to describe and explain shift in the perception of migration in certain European countries in the year 2015. Author succeeded in the first as well as in the latter and covered the shift from a humanitarian perspective to a security approach.

Apart from fulfilling the objectives described in previous paragraph Martinez shed light to the realm of public international law and *Acquis communautaire*, where she examines the rights of states and the rights of refugees.

This highly acute and topical text is dealing with the problem, that most of the EU citizens view as the most pressing issue of today. The work also explains the emerging cleavages between European countries or regions in regard to the topic at hand.

The author provides with comprehensive research and very good analyses of the rhetoric of the country leaders as well as coverage of the most important academic literature, including Barry Buzan, Jeff Huysmans, Campbell and many others.
3) **Methods:** Martinez’s methods are sound and well chosen. She used the Copenhagen School as a theoretical lens and examines the statements of the leaders of the three nations affected by the migration wave. Angela Merkel from Germany, representing a target country, which is accenting humanitarian approach in the early stages of the migration process. Viktor Orban represents a leader of transit country receiving major portion of migrants. Miloš Zeman’s statements are examined as an example of transit country, which has not received a significant number of refugees or asylum applications. It would help to include country that constitutes an entry point for the migrants like Italy or Greece.

4) **Literature:** The thesis is build up on the extensive body of recent literature, which include Ceyhan, Tsoukla, Humphrey, Williams, Agnew, Gerard, Townsend and many others. Author works well with statistical data, include map and graphical content to the thesis and the methods of course analyses are based on seminal Paul Gee’s Discourse analyses.

5) **Manuscript form:** The manuscript is clear, logical and well structured. The author writes in a language devout of any bias and uses proper terminogy, which she meticulously explains in the first chapter. Format and layout of the thesis matches the current academic criteria. The work like this was very needed to examine a topic, that stirred up a lot of emotions and affected the perception of migration throughout Europe. It was a delight to read Ms. Martinez work and therefore I am recommending this paper for a defence. I recommend highest grade for the defendant.
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