

Review of: "The two sides of Experienced Crisis: Enabling and preventing Coping strategies during Covid-19 Pandemic"

Aude Villemain¹

¹ Université d'Orléans

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This study aims to report the two sides of Experienced Crisis: Enabling and preventing Coping strategies during Covid-19 Pandemic.

The originality of this article is based on a real time collection, during the crisis, of qualitative data, through interviews, on many participants (46). It was a rigorous work.

Here are some remarks of substance, form, specific and general.

The abstract is not clear at the beginning. For example, what is « the two different sides of the crisis »? Is it a result or an a priori?

Concerning the introduction, this part is very similar to the abstract in terms of content. This part has to be re-written to introduce the study, objectives, the originality, the issues.

throughout the document, links between the authors' ideas are missing and not articulated.

Often, definitions are missing for example p. 2: what does social reality mean?

The definition given to crisis looks like to the one given to resilience (reversed); why did not you enter in the article with resilience? This remark allows me to address the difficulty of situating this work: In which disciplinary field? with which approach? with which theoretical models?

The study is qualitative, but it does not mean that it should not be based on models or theory.

For me there is a lack of definition. For example, authors are talking about concepts such as fear (for me it is not a concept) without ever defining them. Representations could be different from one person to another but also according to culture.

Sometimes page numbers (when citations) or dates after authors are missing.

You are careful in your writing when it would have been so easy to fall into speculation or popularization. The number of references is also important which is appreciable. However, I would like to point out that author citations are not the only

way to guarantee the scientific aspects of an article. The methodology used is part of it, I will come back to this later.

The part « crisis through coping strategy » enable us to understand that the article is part of a research in social psychology. is this the case? I find it unfortunate that the author does not draw on other readings/writings that have addressed this issue, particularly from the perspective of constructive ergonomics, since the work also seems to be part of a developmental perspective.

This remark confirms the lack of reference for the reader due to the lack of scientific and epistemological positioning of the author in this study.

The ideas are posed as factual and true, justified by the presence of references, but without going to the end of the questioning. For example, concerning resilience, what are the underlying mechanisms, how is the level of resilience assessed?

The author lists all the possible reactions to crisis situations, from avoidance to coping. In all cases, the author mentions coping mechanisms. This raises questions: How does someone who is not resilient behave in this case? What is the difference? is it only a matter of interpretation?

A paragraph with research questions, problematic is missing. What does this article intend to demonstrate?

what are the objectives and challenges of such research? How is this original given the number of articles published on the subject recently? It seems to me that a clearer scientific position would help answer these questions.

We are in the dark.

METHOD :

why did you choose a multicultural sample? especially since this point is not addressed in the first part of the article.

I wonder what message was delivered on the platforms to get participants involved in the study; because I suppose that the people who are doing the worst did not respond favorably to the study. If so, how did you take that into account in the study? Not argued, it could be a scientific bias.

The boundary section (p.6) should be placed at the end of the document before the conclusion part.

For me semi-structured interviews require an interview guideline and is not necessarily phenomenological for descriptive purpose. Please could you precise the kind of interviews?

The analysis part does not explain how data were analyzed. Authors citations or references do not sufficient to make a scientific work. The methodological approach is also important. Thus, how did you proceed to obtain your results from the interviews?

You have decided to combine the result and discussion part, I have no problem with. But could you give a title to this part?

And the title « discussion » should be removed; maybe it is more a conclusion?

RESULTS :

Given the number of participants in this qualitative study ($n = 46!$), the work would benefit from taking this into account when presenting the results. Wouldn't it be possible, for example, to show overall results in percentages? You are not highlighting enough the work you have invested in this research.

A section on the limitations of the study and application would be welcome. What does this study show that we don't already know? You have done a lot of qualitative work, it's a shame not to get more originality out of it. How could these results be used and in what cases?

What conclusion could you give according to multicultural aspects? Or age? Or gender? Otherwise, why did you precise these characteristics?

For me, there is a gap between the title of the study and results/discussion proposed. Prevention did not appear in the document.

This is a consequent qualitative work that I congratulate.