This is an important effort to understand an enormous human rights challenge around the world and, especially, in Israel. It seems that most of the reviewers’ comments can be addressed with a reorganization of the paper using the current text. However, there are needed expansions, explanations and clarifications. Here are the main ones (from my perspective).

1. **The nature and role of mediators**.
	1. Simple explanation of what mediators are in relationship to asylum seekers: their typical tasks, roles and employment status.
	2. What, if anything, does the literature tell us about intercultural mediators in general? What, if anything, does the literature tell us about mediators for asylum seekers, generally and in Israel? How, if at all, do mediators in Israel differ from mediators for asylum seekers in other countries?
		1. In other words, do findings from other research help us to understand mediators in Israel? If not, this is a contribution of your study.
	3. What contribution does the transnationalism literature make to your study and what contribution does your study make to the transnationalism literature? [
		1. This could be an expansion of paragraph beginning *“Empirically, asylum-seeking mediators in Israel and their experience of legal limbo have received little attention. Thus, this project contributes to the research and body of knowledge in the field of transnationalism”*]
	4. Based on this literature, what are the main unanswered questions in the literature about mediators among asylum seekers? (i.e., their challenges, personal impact of role, needed training and support? If you tell us in advance, what’s *new* in your findings will stand out.
2. **How can the concept of liminality help us to understand the nature and impact of mediation for asylum seekers in Israel, more generally?**
	1. Transition from #1, above: To help us explore these unanswered questions, we apply the concept of liminality ….
	2. What is liminality and what is the analytic value of applying this concept to asylum seekers generally, and to asylum seekers in Israel specifically?
	3. Do related literatures use this concept, or is this a contribution of your study?
	4. Some needed clarification/untangling:
		1. On the one hand, your study focuses on legal liminality *(“This article addresses liminal legality’s complexity and its expressions among asylum seekers in Israel who work formally as translators, but in practice, serve as cultural and social mediators.”*), but you also mention liminality in multiple other ways (*“civic liminality;” “they also find themselves in a liminal place concerning the health, psychological, social, and economic aspects of their lives”)*.
		2. Is the term ‘dual liminality’ needed to explain your study? If not, it adds another level of complexity that would be nice to avoid.
	5. Consider focusing here on the definition and analytic value of the concept liminality, but moving much of the early text to a Discussion section. Much of what’s here could help frame your findings *after* you report them.
3. **Your overarching hypothesis/research question and the main contribution of your study**.
	1. Is it this (if restated as questions or hypotheses, rather than an argument)?
		1. *“liminality stemming from their ambivalent legal status places mediators in a legal limbo characterized by transience and uncertainty* (Bhabha, 2009; Menjívar, 2006; Sabar & Shir, 2019; Turner, 1967); *this compounds their professional liminality, rooted in the tension between working with the host country’s professional team while also being asylum seekers lacking permanent status.”*
		2. *“We argue that mediation is affected by political and social circumstances—transience, marginalization, and the ongoing threat of deportation….”*
		3. *“While intercultural mediators have been the subject of many studies, their legal status has rarely been addressed.”*
		4. Consider organizing all of the above and rephrasing, “this study explores the ways in which mediators are affected by … etc.”
4. **Methodology section needs to be organized and expanded.**
	1. **Qualitative interpretive approach & semi-structured interviews**
		1. Why did you choose a qualitative methodology? (In other words, why were your questions best answered with qualitative methods?)
			1. You may be able to use a version of the following as an explanation: A possible reason is embedded in your text: *“This research also employed a qualitative interpretive approach that views the subjects’ reality as a whole rather than in isolated segments. Focusing on what is invisible to the researchers—the unique subjectivity of the interviewees—this approach aims to depict their world through the cultural lens through which they view it and their place in it (Sabar & Shir, 2019).”*
		2. Why did you choose semi-structured interviews as your qualitative data collection method? For example, from [this source](https://fmch.bmj.com/content/7/2/e000057): “Semi-structured in-depth interviews … typically consists of a dialogue between researcher and participant, guided by a flexible interview protocol and supplemented by follow-up questions, probes and comments. The method allows the researcher to collect open-ended data, to explore participant thoughts, feelings and beliefs about a particular topic and to delve deeply into personal and sometimes sensitive issues.”
		3. What were the general themes guided your interview questions and what were your follow-up questions/probes? How did you select them? Did you use a protocol? What was it? Do you want to include the questions in an appendix? You have a sentence that may include these categories, but it’s not clear – also be careful to not ‘judge’ the categories: “The questions covered their personal immigration history their lives as …. the complex relationships with organizations’ staff….”
	2. Participants [most of this is in the paper, but scattered in various places]
		1. How were they invited [include what invitees were told about the purpose of the interview, how long it would be, where it would take place, and whether they would be paid for their time?]
			1. The details are currently in various places in the text. Be sure to include the importance of beginning by mapping the organizations, as that was an important part of your selection process.
		2. Did you interview everyone who agreed? If not, how did you select? How many were selected? How many completed the interviews?
		3. Participant characteristics (a table might be helpful), including: their country of origin? Time in Israel? In what setting did they work (public office, nonprofit, private? other)? Training? How many reported doing informal mediation? Paid or volunteer? What tasks were they responsible for (based on what you knew before you interviewed them – from the organizations in which they worked)? How did they learn Hebrew?
	3. Analysis (more needed, plus citations)
		1. Why and how did you employ narrative analysis? Were there transcripts of the interviews? What was your process for analyzing the transcripts? (Typically, this is an iterative process – with various researchers identifying themes, then discussing, then narrowing and refining.) More detail needed.
5. **Results/Findings**
	1. There are several places in the initial sections – before you report your results – where you make statements that I would have expected that you *learned from the interviewees.* This makes it impossible to know which statements are your assumptions (or pre-study biases), which are accepted based on the literature, and which are findings from your study. For example:
		1. “this paper views mediation as an activity that challenges their liminal status as asylum seekers” 🡪 Since the interviewees specifically comment on changes in their sense of agency, self-worth, etc., that followed from their formal and informal mediation roles, this seems to be a finding. If so, why tell the reader this before reporting the findings?
		2. “Intercultural mediation is, therefore, a sociopolitical action.” 🡪 Do you know this from the literature? If not, it’s either an assumption or a finding from the interviews.
		3. “Mediators develop strategies of self and communal representation from a position of weakness in social power relations and the liminality of their temporary status.” 🡪 Do you know this from the literature? If not, it’s either an assumption or a finding from the interviews.
6. **Discussion –** You lay out the impact on asylum seeking mediators of playing the role of mediators. Consider also including the implications of your paper’s findings for other groups who operate in the ‘liminal zone’ – either formally orinformally. For example: outreach workers in nonprofit organizations who share characteristics with those they seek to reach or serve (e.g., those with addictions, homelessness, mental illness); prison guards (Jewish history points especially to Kapos in concentration camp guards, but also prison guards in the U.S. who come from the same deprived backgrounds as those who are incarcerated).
7. **Conclusion and Recommendations**.
	1. What are the implications of your findings for policies around asylum seekers and/or mediators, for organizations employing mediators, or for any other groups that operate with people who themselves inhabit but who also serve as mediators (the following come to mind: outreach workers with lived experience with addictions, homelessness, mental illness; prison guards who come from the same deprived backgrounds as those who are incarcerated (see Jewish history on kapos).

* 1. What are the recommended policy, practice or legal changes that follow from your study (i.e., preparation, training, deployment, ongoing support, professional status of mediators?

**Finally, based on my reading of your paper, this seems to be the argument you are making. If you agree, consider writing a short introduction (1-2 pages) to your paper summarizing the following and explaining how your paper will be organized:**

1. The number of asylum seekers has been growing globally, particularly those displaced by war or persecution [data]. Their situation is often terrible [include your numerous examples].
2. Within the global group of asylum seekers, those in Israel face unique challenges. As will be described in the paper, reasons include not only the fact that policies for non-Jewish refugees are less than a decade old, but that there are cultural barriers to welcoming non-Jewish immigrants in general; other. As a result, there are few public sector processes, direct services or even a commitment to help [data on probability of claims being accepted]; nonprofit organizations pick up the slack, but there are few [provide data]. All of this exacerbates the ongoing, long-term uncertainty about the legal status and rights, as well as access to healthcare services, education (including classes for learning Hebrew), employment and various forms of public transfer payments.
3. To the extent that a ‘system’ exists at all for addressing the needs and legal status of asylum seekers in Israel, it relies on a subgroup of such asylum seekers who have learned the dominant language (Hebrew) and act as mediators – offering their services both formally and informally as translators, XXX, XXX and XXX **[all their roles]**. In effect, XX,000 people rely on this network to manage the ongoing challenges related to asylum seeking in Israel. Understanding how they function in their dual role as asylum seekers and service providers to other refugees is essential for **XXX [why your paper is important].**
4. We draw not only on the findings and perspectives from the **transnationalism literature**, but it uniquely [? true?] apply the **concept of liminality** in an effort to **describe the context** [?] in which asylum-seeking and mediation, in particular, occur. Mediators, like other asylum seekers inhabit the transitional – or liminal – space between leaving one country or culture and being accepted as full members of another country or culture. However, the concept of liminality helps to provide context for the additional space occupied by mediators – translating both language and its cultural context – to both host country employees and to other asylum seekers alike.
5. Relying on semi-structured interviews to invite mediators to share their perspectives on their work and its impact, this qualitative study therefore explores the following questions: **XXX, YYY, and ZZZ [these are your research questions]**.
6. The paper is organized as follows:
	1. The first section, Asylum-Seeking and Mediation in Israel [A, B and C]
	2. Insights from the literature and the concept of liminality [D]
	3. Methodology
	4. Results (Findings?)
	5. Discussion
	6. Conclusions and Recommendations