

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

Jane Davis¹

¹ University of Toronto

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The study is interesting and provides subjective understandings of how social identities are shaped by forced migration. I congratulate you on engaging in this research, and I'm fascinated by the talking stones approach. I have a few suggestions for consideration.

Overall, in relation to grammar and style, a few points: a) Data are plural. b) There are words missing in the text in various places - a close proofread would solve those as it is overall well written. c) Also, one way to ensure clarity in writing is to always include a referent – don't use "This" verb phrasing as it can be difficult for the reader to understand what the referent is supposed to be.

Although I have co-authored qualitative work in relation to temporary protection in Turkey, Canadian refugee and immigrant children and youth's experiences, and the migration experiences of Syrian refugee youth within Canada, the focus is on their daily activities and how their environments shaped the performance of their activities. I am not well versed in the theoretical perspective used in this study; however, it is clearly presented and seems applied well throughout.

Thus, most of my comments are in relation to methodology. Each part of the methods section is well described; however, when trying to make sense of the whole methodology, some clarification is needed to improve coherence. I would recommend describing your paradigm and positionality first. Since you have used an approach that you feel will help to remove your biases from the research rather than using your biases to expand understanding, it is important to state and describe your paradigm of inquiry – ontology and epistemology – at the start, as well as your own positionality in relation to the research topic. Then present your methodological approach, which should carry through the full methods section. As you focus the research on ensuring the voices of the participants are heard, your paradigm needs to align with the methodological approach. The idea of generalisability within the limitations section does not align with exploring multiple subjective experiences (the voices of the participants). It is a positivistic construct in relation to rigour and doesn't make sense in qualitative work. The concept that is more aligned is transferability, which is a process undertaken by readers, and many of the reviewers have demonstrated transferability in their reviews. Generalisability should and cannot be a point of rigour in a study that is focused on understanding fallible and partial subjective understandings. You can still position your 'deductive' but open approach (which I view as aligning more with Hsieh and Shannon's directed content

analysis (<https://doi.org/10.1177/10497323052766>) within an interpretivist or constructivist approach to research. In addition, our focus on establishing a theoretical model for your themes fits closer to Strauss' version of Grounded Theory, which sits within a positivistic paradigm. Thus, considering and stating your paradigm and positionality is very important for the readers of this study to make sense of your methodological approach, for establishing and demonstrating methodological coherence and the strategies used to establish rigour, and for demonstrating clarity and confirmability of findings in the discussion.