

# Review of: "Collective Guilt and the Search for Meaning in Post-Communist Albania: An Existential Perspective"

Bayartsetseg Terbish<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ghent University

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

I was intrigued to read this interesting article. Focusing on the collective guilt is one of the innovative approach of this article, I believe. I have several comments for further improvement of this article. My language may be a bit harsh sometimes, so please do not be offended.

**General comment:**

1. I am not a native English speaker, however I'd like to suggest having this article proof-read by someone better than you and me for thoroughness and more clarity. Throughout the text, I found it a stumbling to understand the meaning you tried to convey due to the language issues.
2. I'd suggest to make the abstract stronger and catchier.
3. In the 1st paragraph of p.3, what do you mean by healing process? healing from what? plse be specific. Also the last sentence in this para (Through active discussion and analysis, we hope our findings may inform future interventions directed toward achieving these goals.) needs some polishing. What are those goals?

**Literature Review section:**

1. Three sections discussed in this LR is too below are too short, plus less summative but descriptive. I would shift my way of review towards more analytical rather than descriptive.
2. In the "meaning making" section, you need to mention the citation for the second sentence.

**Methodology section:**

1. what do you mean by self-selection? I don't quite get it.
2. In the 3rd para, you stated that participants were asked to write narratives about their experiences related to collective guilt and meaning-making in the context of Albania's post-communist transition. How to ask about collective guilt and meaning making as these are not simply put in the questions, I am afraid. I mean these must be quite "think" concepts which exist in the thick of life. Did you use some guidance questions as a frame for these concepts or let participants just write about their memories of the communist past? these aspects needs to be clear and mentioned.

**Results section:**

1. one of the subtitles start with “antecedents and consequences....”. I'd suggest using different wording instead of antecedent.

Discussion section:

1. what is the main field of your study? I am still not quite clear about it. Anthropology? Sociology? Public policy? I would make your field clear so that your discussion comes in line with the certain discipline you chose. May be interdisciplinary.
2. Moreover, I would suggest to re-write this discussion section wholly as it lacks substantial input or significance implication for your chosen field. the only sentence I could find interesting is: "Thus, the findings deriving from this study bear great significance for societies that have been affected by communism in the past. " Other than this sentence, the entire section lacks tangibility, substantial implication for whatever the field you have chosen.

Conclusion section:

1. I am hesitating the need for having both Discussion and Conclusion section. Probably you may want to integrate these two sections for more analytical concluding remarks.