

Review of: "Emergent Prefigurative Politics and Social Psychological Processes: A Systematic Review and Research Agenda"

Mina Dragouni¹

¹ Panteios University of Economics and Political Sciences Athens

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This is a very interesting and well-written literature review paper, with clear goals, scope, and methodology, which I've really enjoyed reading. I'm noting some minor comments and recommendations that I hope the authors will find useful.

On page 3, with regards to the Marxist scholarly work on the topic, the authors make reference to Barker (1995), noting that the author sees 'a dialectical coincidence of societal change and self-transformation within a single process'. This seems very interesting, although a bit difficult to grasp, and it would be useful to add 1-2 explanatory sentences.

The authors provide a very thorough account of their methodological process. As they report, the work they review was published between 2016 and 2023 (page 7). Did they narrow down their search of related literature to the most recent? It would be useful to specify whether there was also a 'time-of-publication' criterion.

As a general reader not familiar with psychology literature, I would suggest adding a short definition of 'social psychological processes' at the beginning of the thematic analysis (p. 9).

The last paragraph on page 11, which presents the challenges (subtheme 1.3), is a bit laconic. It is not clear what the challenges are in the cited studies, and I believe they would deserve a bit more attention.

The authors identify a critical theoretical and methodological gap in the extant literature, and they rightly note that we need more studies across non-western economies. They then move on to propose some theoretical models and recommend for future studies that combine longitudinal and ethnographic research. I think these recommendations require some further elaboration to guide further work on the topic, since this is a key contribution of the paper. For example, how the theoretical models proposed can enrich the interpretation of mixed-methods data? What, in their minds, would be an ideal longitudinal/mixed-methods study on the topic?