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**Reviewer's report:**

The paper is much improved but still needs to be edited for meaning and English usage. There are many instances where the meaning is not clear, for example:

Page 4 “HRH planning can include projections about cross-cutting problems…” Planning can consider this issue, but projections rarely focus on them—the sentence implies you “project” these issues. Reword to say these issues can be considered as part of projections.

Page 4 end of paragraph with ref (15): Include sentence saying that his paper describes a “trend analysis, using existing data to anticipate supply and demand issue in Serbia.”

Page 7: “Rations” for ratios...

Page 8: Clarify: “Its purpose is to meet the requirement … “ Do you refer to the purpose of the study or the article? This is a bit confusing; reword for clarity.

Page 16, the discussion of GDP loss is confusing, two numbers conflict.

Page 19: Models are simplifications of reality and provide a glimpse into the future based on the limitations of the models. With unanticipated changes…”

The paper needs careful editing by a professional and the uncertainty in some statements cleaned up.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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I have no competing interests other than having been asked to be a co-author due to the extensive copy-editing I did. That was a little embarrassing. Unfortunately, the paper still need extensive copy-editing