

# Review of: "Post-Conflict Reconstruction: How Social Identity Change Informs our Understanding of the Ukrainian Experience of Forced Migration"

Nuelle Novik<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Campion College

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I have appreciated the opportunity to review this article. Overall, I find the article to be very well-written, very well-organized, and very well-researched. The references are relevant and appropriate. This paper is very interesting to read, and the topic is very timely. I really have enjoyed reading this article.

I did note some minor grammatical issues as follows:

1) on pg. 6, under "Semi-Structured Interview Schedule", the second line of the section reads: "... and what life **was**life before...". I assume that the second "life" should be "like". There also seems to be a typo in the bracketed section in the same sentence, and the final sentence punctuation is missing at the end of the sentence. There appears to be final sentence punctuation missing elsewhere in this same paragraph.

2) on pg. 7, in the third line from the bottom of the page, it should read: "...**of** their social identities ..."

3) on pg. 11, in the first paragraph after the first direct quote – it reads a bit unclearly – I think that there are a couple of typos or small grammatical issues that need to be addressed – the issues seem to be in the last sentence of that paragraph in particular.

4) on pg. 15, in the first paragraph after the title "Sub-Theme: Possibility", the sentence content reads: "...in similar accounts **of** given by ...". I think that the word "of" should be removed.

5) on pg. 17, in the first paragraph after the title "Discussion", the sentence content reads: "...change among**Ukrainians** 'guests'...". I don't think that "Ukrainian" should be plural in that context.

6) on pg. 18, in the second paragraph, in the third line, the sentence content reads: "... in supporting**an** understanding the ...". I think the word should be "and" and not "an".

I thought that the author(s) provided a very clear description of the methodology, as well as an explanation as to why the particular methodology was incorporated. They have offered a very clear explanation and description of the process followed during the deductive thematic analysis. I think the authors made very good choices about the direct quotes that they decided to incorporate, and they have done an excellent job of integrating relevant academic literature with the direct quotes. This helped to add context and perspective.

I have read this article several times, and I have to admit that I am still struggling with getting my head around what is reading (to me) as a bit of a dismissal of the relevance of a trauma-focused approach to supporting and working with individuals who have experienced a forced migration. I think what I am struggling with is my belief that there is an important role for a “trauma-informed” approach, which – of course – is very different from a “trauma-focused” approach. Perhaps the distinction between the two is beyond the scope of this document; I am not sure, but I do leave that up to the authors to decide. I do believe that the authors provide a clear and relevant discussion and explanation as to why they have chosen the framework that they have chosen.

As a final thought, I find myself reflecting on the “Strengths, Limitations, and Future Research” section of the document. The authors may want to consider including individuals with lived experience in designing and carrying out the research in future projects.