

Review of: "Exploring Historical and Contemporary Academic Disparities: A Comparative Study of Black and Non-Black Nova Scotians"

Dr. Tiffany Lachelle Smith¹

¹ Sheikh Saud Bin Saqr Al Qasimi Foundation For Policy Research

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Research is near and dear to my heart, and I start this review with an expression of gratitude for posting your article and for being receptive to the various responses that come your way. I've read your article and would like to provide a few suggestions, some for more information and others for a deeper analysis of the study and data.

This study is about exploring the historical and contemporary academic disparities of Black and non-Black Nova Scotians. While reading your introduction, I expected to read about academic disparities, including statistics and specific information about the problem. However, much of the discussion is about the complexities of identity demographics. You provide a general conversation about the "subpar educational outcomes of Blacks in Nova Scotia," but there is no data to support this claim. As a quantitative study, this is important to add because as a reader, this information will help me to better understand your research design and discussion.

Another thing to consider about your introduction is that I was very surprised to read about literacy and math tests in your methods section when there was very little discussion about them in the intro. I was also surprised to know that your data focused on the test results for children in K-12 when this was not mentioned in your intro either. A stronger link connecting all the factors explored in this study would be beneficial.

My last comment is regarding the design. Could you please explain what the Minnesota database is? Is this a global database? What is it? Who is it for? Why was it developed, and why was it an ideal source of data for this research? I'm also wondering about the mention of literacy abilities only reported in 1911. What does this mean regarding analysis? Is this a limitation? Does this directly impact the analysis?

Thinking more deeply about these areas might assist with strengthening your conclusion, which is much more complex than "admixture" as a factor for improved academic results. As mentioned by one of the other reviewers, there are many other factors not mentioned or considered in this study, and taking on a mixed-methods approach might add a bit more nuance to the numbers.

Overall, this is a very interesting research topic. However, when engaging with marginalized groups, we as academics must be very careful about the "knowledge" being produced. Consider adding a qualitative component to gather data about the "counter story" as well.

