

This paper is on a very interesting and highly relevant topic. I very much like the paper and I strongly support (and have engaged myself with) this kind of ideas and work. However, I doubt whether the current version is sufficiently informative and convincing for a broader readership of social psychologists. I tried to read the paper with such an audience in mind.

The paper addresses many different issues and questions, and also in a rather 'abstract' way. For a reader not familiar with critical social psychology it will be quite difficult to understand the different ideas, claims and so on: also because quite some 'critical jargon' is used which makes the paper difficult to read for an 'outsider'.

It would be helpful when it is made clear how the current conceptualization and approach differs from 'mainstream' social psychology where terms such as 'dual identity', 'multiple identities', and 'identity complexity' are increasingly being used. At the bottom of page 9 and at page 10 it is indicated that it is necessary to 'destabilize psychological theorizing about youth subjectivities and about culture'. What kind of psychological theorizing have the authors in mind; e.g. many (cultural and developmental) psychologists would agree with what is said about 'culture' at the top of page 10. How exactly does a hyphenated perspective 'advance and challenge social psychology to reconsider some of its basic assumptions' (which assumptions)?

Throughout the paper an implicit contrast is used between a 'critical' and a 'mainstream' perspective. Such a contrast tends to homogenize 'mainstream' approaches, suggests that these approaches are not 'critical', and that they have untenable or limiting assumptions. It is quite possible to make these arguments but why not be more explicit about all this?

It would also help when one or two concrete examples were given about what sort of results these critical studies provide. As a reader one's gets curious about what exactly this kind of work has to offer.

In the abstract and the start of the paper it is argued that the authors want to 'dust off' three key social psychological notions. It is not very clear, however, how exactly these notions inform the inquiry on youth identity (actually, so many ideas, concepts and perspectives are being referred to that it becomes a bit confusing).

I have the impression that the term 'hyphen' is used in a rather loose and overarching way referring to quite some different situations and phenomena. What is the difference, for example, with terms such as 'hybridity', 'liminality', and 'creolization'? (on page 9 a list of references is given as examples of studies on hyphenated selves, but there are many – and important – differences between these studies and they do not all use the term 'hyphenation').

I also noted that the authors speak about 'hyphenated selves' (and 'subjectivities') but also of 'identities'. Is there no conceptual difference between 'self' and 'identity'? Particularly for 'critical' work such a distinction seems quite important for understanding how socio-political conditions and categories impact on self-understandings. In other words, can we simply treat terms such as 'self', 'subjectivity', and 'identity' as synonymous? What exactly is distinctive about 'hyphenated selves'?

I understand that the paper focuses on the 'positive' or promising aspect of critical inquiry and methods, but as a reader one wonders whether there are no 'costs' or pitfalls. Should we all start to examine youth under siege from this critical perspective or can 'mainstream' perspectives also make a contribution in understanding and improving their lives?