The first piece dealing with the creation of the Buryat-Mongolian Autonomous Soviet Republic (in my eyes) consists basically of two essays which are only loosely entangled with each other. I would recommend that the author significantly shortens the first part which deals with the mapping projects of this time period - this could be the subject of a separate publication. In the context of exploring the group identities and separatist movements under investigation (second part of the paper), however, it would suffice to briefly sketch (in a narrative way) the complex landscapes of patterns of religious communities, ethnic groups, natural resources etc which are relevant for properly assessing the theme of the second part. This latter part could then be expanded, and more detail could be added.

I am very intrigued by your discussion of identity and space. At times, I think, tensions and different interests could be addressed more critically, for example in your conclusion. Also, as you will see, I take issue with your over-use of disentanglement and framings. First, I think you need to define these terms very clearly and explain why they help us understand this history in a better way. Second, I have trouble bringing disentanglement and the various unification/re-organisation projects together. I wonder if disentanglement is not more adequately referring to your work as a scholar to make sense of these “entanglements”.

Regarding footnotes: most readers will not be able to consult the many works you mention in Russian. As the footnotes will even grow with translations added, please substantially cut references and limit yourself to the most important one or two (this will also make translating the titles a more pleasant job for you…)