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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:
The thesis seeks to address the key issue of China's future approach to the system of international relations. Main research question is: “Is China’s involvement in the international community comparable to the role of previous empires? What does the behavior of the Chinese, British and American empires tell us about the future behavior of China?” The author tries to answer this question in the context of a (neo) realistic approach through comparison of the rise and retreat/decline of the three "empires" – Qing Dynasty, British Empire and the USA, by analyzing their "imperial toolbox".

2) Contribution:
The issue of China's rise and the question of possible impacts on the system of international relations is a current and relevant subject of research. Comparing the previous behavior of imperial China, Britain and the United States could provide a guideline for predicting the future behavior of the People's Republic of China, or to point out possible pitfalls. The inclusion of imperial China is essential, as modern China is clearly rooted in its historical legacy. The inclusion of two Western thalassocratic powers is essential as these powers have created and managed modern global system of international relations, and China is also becoming a major thalassocratic actor with increasingly visible ambitions in the field of making global rules and organizations. However, the potential of a very interesting topic was unfortunately not fulfilled, as the work was done in great hurry and its current form does not correspond to the standards that are required.

3) Methods:
The historical comparative analysis method, based on three case studies, is a suitable tool for research in relation to the chosen topic.
4) Literature:
The list of used resources is quite extensive, but unfortunately reflects the rush in which the work was written. From the sources used, it was possible to create the basic outlines of the topic, which should subsequently be anchored in other relevant sources, but this did not happen.

5) Manuscript form:
The weakest part of the work is, unfortunately, its processing. Even though I know that work has been completed in great hurry, one cannot ignore the fundamental shortcomings in terms of numbering of individual parts of the text, processing the list of used literature and resources, inappropriate reference to resources. The formal requirements of the text must be an essential part of the overall assessment.
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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).
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