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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: Theoretical fundamentals are relevant for the topic. However, regarding the nationalism, the author has relied mainly on the older, although relevant works. Nevertheless, the author tried to cover the broad complexity of the phenomenon of nationalism, omitting no one of the main concepts, and theoretical approaches used in the work are generally consistent with the matter. The author had to cope with a broad list of concepts that deal with the issue of nationalism within Yugoslavia as well. In general, the theory in the work is incorporated consistently with both the topic and hypotheses, but the theoretical background could be somewhat wider.

2) Contribution: The topic is not novel, which is understandable given the attention that causes the break-up of former Yugoslavia for more than a quarter century. For a less experienced author then, the options to come up with new findings are quite limited. The author's contribution can hardly be innovative, but despite the limitations mentioned above she is attempting a fairly fresh approach. For the author, however, this topic is of personal importance, and this needs to be respected. The work has certainly far greater benefit for herself, as a form of dealing with the history of her own country. I would emphasize her fair effort to get acquainted with the matter (she certainly did explain why the observed phenomena occurred), select certain ideas from the tangle of existing views, and give a comprehensive summarization within this framework. As a person acquainted with the complexity of approaches toward the break-up of Yugoslavia, I appreciate this selection and summarization as a specific value added.

3) Methods: Methodology is frequently the biggest problem of theses; here it is not. In the introduction the author clearly summarizes the matter, on this basis she formulates research questions, proposes hypotheses and describes how to find the answers. The work then consistently follows the structure defined by the research questions. The hypotheses are analyzed comprehensively, through both quantitative and qualitative methods. Given the nature of the topic, where the author deals with economic crisis and the process of institutional decision-making in response to it, it is adequate to use both qualitative and quantitative approaches. Analytical tools are
selected adequately, but the author could explain the use of the tools somewhat more. The conclusion clearly recapitulates what the author had found out.

4) Literature: Considering the matter and methodology, the literature is chosen appropriately, but the selection is rather short. The author consistently relies on relevant scientific sources. The number of sources is sufficient, but it would be appropriate to rely not only on the monographs, which make up the majority of sources, but on articles as well. It is necessary to appreciate the fact that the list includes contemporary scientific sources dealing with the issue of Yugoslav economic crisis (from the period of 1982-1990), and that there is balanced proportion of authors from the former Yugoslavia and elsewhere.

5) Manuscript form: I appreciate the language, both in terms of grammar and style. The author presents a complex topic with a rare factual and easy, well-readable style. She structured the text appropriately. Her evaluation can be easily traced. The tables are chosen appropriately. I would criticize only a few minor errors or typos in the bibliography and citation style, but the overall format of the text, including quotations is on high level.
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The referee should give comments to the following requirements:

1) THEORETICAL BACKGROUND: Can you recognize that the thesis was guided by some theoretical fundamentals relevant for this thesis topic? Were some important theoretical concepts omitted? Was the theory used in the thesis consistently incorporated with the topic and hypotheses tested?

- Strong 20 points
- Average 10 points
- Weak 0 points

2) CONTRIBUTION: Evaluate if the author presents original ideas on the topic and aims at demonstrating critical thinking and ability to draw conclusions based on the knowledge of relevant theory and relevant empirical material. Is there a distinct value added of the thesis (relative to knowledge of a university-educated person interested in given topic)? Did the author explain why the observed phenomena occurred? Were the policy implications well founded?

- Strong 20 points
- Average 10 points
- Weak 0 points

3) METHODS: Are the hypotheses for this study clearly stated, allowing their further verification and testing? Are the theoretical explanations, empirical material and analytical tools used in the thesis relevant to the research question being investigated, and adequate to the aspiration level of the study? Is the thesis topic comprehensively analyzed and does the thesis not make trivial or irrelevant detours off the main body stated in the thesis proposal? More than 10 points signal an exceptional work, which requires your explanation "why" it is so).

- Strong 20 points
- Average 10 points
- Weak 0 points

4) LITERATURE REVIEW: The thesis demonstrates author's full understanding and command of recent literature. The author quotes relevant literature in a proper way and disposes with a representative bibliography. (Remark: references to Wikipedia, websites and newspaper articles are a sign of poor research). If they dominate you cannot give more than 8 points. References to books published by prestigious publishers and articles in renowned journals give much better impression.

- Strong 20 points
- Average 10 points
- Weak 0 points

5) MANUSCRIPT FORM: The thesis is clear and well structured. The author uses appropriate language and style, including academic format for quotations, graphs and tables. The text effectively refers to graphs and tables, is easily readable and stimulates thinking.

- Strong 20 points
- Average 10 points
- Weak 0 points
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