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1. First, please do not submit your work in PDF format. This makes it very difficult to insert comments, which is done in “bubbles”. Papers should be submitted in Word so that comments can be inserted in the text, and that way the many spelling and grammar errors can be corrected while “tracking changes”. See the individual comments in the body of the document in “bubbles”.
2. In general, the paper is very detailed, filled with personal details and illegible graphs. It could have been shortened, and the main conclusions in each section summarized.
3. Rich learning and charging are evident, the research question is relevant, and there are various references to it. It is also possible to generally understand the issue, the possible answer, and the question of the connection to the diaspora of immigrants as a whole.
4. The appendices are rich in content that reflects learning.
5. The following are some individual comments, in addition to corrections in the text:
   1. There are quite a few proofreading and wording errors in English. If there is an English-speaking member of the team, it is advisable that he will go through and clean up the writing.
   2. In every description of a meeting, you included in the first paragraph the full resume of the person you have met. This is clearly unnecessary; a list can be compiled as an appendix, but not in the body of the work.
   3. There are people with whom you have met who turned out to be completely irrelevant to the research question. In such cases, the detail had to be avoided, as it deviates from the topic, and its contribution to the document is unclear. For example, in the case of the bishop who spoke of Jewish-Serbian relations. This has nothing to do with the issue of brain drain. This is also true for the tour of the mine, which was a sort of a “tourist” tour on the first day. Even the meeting with the US ambassador is not directly related to the research question. In addition, is was not explained how does the issue of negotiations in Kosovo relate to the issue.
   4. All graphs and tables are illegible and without titles.
   5. Some things require a reference, and it seems that they rely only on a meeting or two, which cannot be representative of the whole. For example, the statements about the students on page 18 towards the end of the first part - were their statements supported by valid studies/data?
   6. On page 20 in the first point, under section eight - there is a reference to Wikipedia as a source of research. It is not fitting for such a level of writing.
   7. What is the meaning of the statement about the “discovery of the truth” at the end of the sixth line in section eight?
   8. From the conclusions it can be implied that no processing sessions were done during the tour - is this a correct or incorrect impression?
6. In conclusion, the work could have been shorter, worded accurately and accompanied by all the appendices - while excluding resume sections, meetings which were irrelevant to the research question, and more accurate wording of the findings.
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