

Peer Review

Review of: "Understanding the 2024 Summer Riots in the UK: Three Case Studies"

Seema Irshad¹

1. Department of Clinical Neuroscience, College of Medicine, King Faisal University, Saudi Arabia

Article Title: Understanding the 2024 Summer Riots in the UK: Three Case Studies

Authors: John Drury, Roger Ball, Julius Cesar Alejandre, et al.

Submission Type: Research Article

Review Outcome: Accept with Minor Revisions

1. Title and Abstract

Evaluation: The title is accurate and informative. The abstract provides a concise and clear summary of the research, methodology, findings, and implications.

Suggestion: No changes required.

2. Introduction and Background

Evaluation: The introduction is well-written and thoroughly contextualizes the study within relevant political and historical frameworks. It justifies the need for empirical research by critiquing earlier, often politically motivated interpretations of riots.

Strengths:

Historical comparisons with the 2011 riots are thoughtful.

Establishes a clear gap in previous literature.

Suggestion:

Briefly define "riot" vs. "protest" earlier for clarity, given the contested terminology.

3. Research Questions and Objectives

Evaluation: The paper clearly outlines three research questions, which are directly addressed through the case study methodology.

Suggestion:

Make the theoretical orientation (e.g., social identity theory) more explicit in this section.

4. Methodology

Evaluation: The methodology is robust, transparent, and appropriate for the research questions. Triangulation of data sources, including interviews, arrest data, social media, and news reports, enhances credibility.

Strengths:

Clear case selection rationale.

Ethical approval documented.

Suggestion:

Include a brief explanation of how the reliability of social media sources was assessed.

5. Case Study Narratives and Analysis

Evaluation: The narratives are comprehensive, well-evidenced, and insightful. They provide rich qualitative detail and a clear timeline of events.

Suggestion:

Include a comparative table summarizing key features of the three riots for easier cross-case synthesis.

6. Findings

Evaluation: Findings are well-organized and effectively respond to the research questions. The distinctions between types of participants and the nature of the events are thoughtfully elaborated.

Suggestion:

Add a brief "Summary of Findings" section prior to the discussion.

7. Discussion and Interpretation

Evaluation: The discussion is critical and reflective, offering insightful comparisons with the 2011 riots and raising new questions for future research.

Suggestion:

Use subheadings to organize themes within the discussion section.

Relate findings more explicitly to theoretical frameworks from social psychology or criminology.

8. Policy Implications

Evaluation: The policy discussion is nuanced and significant. It critiques the dangers of oversimplifying riot motivations and offers recommendations relevant to researchers and policymakers.

Suggestion:

Emphasize the value of interdisciplinary collaboration in designing future policy responses.

9. Ethical Considerations

Evaluation: Ethical approval is documented, and appropriate procedures were followed.

Suggestion:

Acknowledge limitations of not interviewing anti-immigrant participants in more detail.

10. Writing and Presentation

Evaluation: The manuscript is well-written, accessible, and logically structured.

Suggestion:

Minor editorial polishing could help improve flow in longer narrative sections.

11. Data Availability

Evaluation: Strong adherence to open science principles, with publicly available datasets and supplementary materials.

Suggestion: None.

12. Originality and Contribution

Evaluation: The study provides novel empirical insights into a highly relevant and under-researched phenomenon. It significantly advances understanding of contemporary collective violence.

Suggestion: None.

Final Recommendation: Accept with Minor Revisions

This is an important and timely contribution to the literature on public disorder, protest, and far-right mobilization. Addressing the minor suggestions above will enhance its clarity and accessibility without requiring substantive changes to its core content.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.