



**Paper: “Identity Resilience and Professional Reconstruction Among Internally Displaced Youth in Burkina Faso's Central Region”**

**Submitted: 10 August 2025**

**Accepted: 29 November 2025**

**Published: 31 December 2025**

Corresponding Author: Dakuyo Elie Corneille

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n35p36

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Gordana Nikola Stankovska  
University of Tetova, Republic of Macedonia

Reviewer 2: Dramane Ouattara  
Alassane Ouattara University of Bouake, Cote d'Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Blinded

-----  
Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Accept Submission  
-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The topic's title is as relevant as it tremendously helps understand the an-ongoing crisis environment the country, Burkina Faso still undergoes. And debating issues related to identity in order to solve out or solution migration or and immigration problems, stands as the kernel issue of any attempt of territory reconquest and reconstruction. The topic is clearly stated and easily comprehensible.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The abstract, despite of it being long (18 lines) where ( less than 10 lines are generally expected) clearly highlights the essential points of the research objective along with the results of the analysis (interviews, data analysis...). When reading this abstract, we easily comprehend and follow the researcher's process and issues related to his approach on the basis of the list of questions raised earlier.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

I underlined some spelling and grammatical errors, providing the work with the correct or right spelling. The general observation on error spelling, is the persistence use of the simple past as the language of the work analysis. As a research, the work is still valuable and update, so under this reality, the use of the Simple Present is undebatable.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The quantitative approach mixed with critical thinking process directs and facilitates the conduct of the research. The mentioned approach is used with easiness by the researcher showing his maturity and mastering ability.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

As mentioned previously, the work presents and includes some errors of spelling and...notwithstanding these slight errors, the body fits the an going analysis.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

Good insights and very interesting conclusion that helps comprehend the results of the study.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The references in the list of "References" are also the one mentioned in the text.

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the BODY of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

***Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

This research work needs some minor revision to obey the norm of full acceptance. Take into account the mentioned observation to improve both the quality of the work and giving it some social, and intellectual value, that will set your work on the level of scientific research.

-----

-----

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The title is clear, concise, and accurately reflects the content of the study. It effectively conveys the main variables (“identity resilience” and “professional project reconstruction”) and the target population (“internally displaced youth in Burkina Faso”).

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

Effectively summarizes objectives, methods, and key findings. Slight sentence tightening could improve readability.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

The language is very clear without grammatical errors and spelling mistakes.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The methodology is clearly described, including participant selection (25 internally displaced youth aged 18–30), data collection (semi-structured interviews), and analysis (thematic analysis inspired by grounded theory).

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

The body of the paper is clear. The results are presented clearly, with logical interpretation in the discussion

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

The conclusion accurately reflects the content of the paper and is supported by the findings. It effectively highlights the role of psychosocial protective factors and provides meaningful implications for supporting displaced youth.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The references are comprehensive, relevant, and current. Ensuring consistent formatting according to the journal's guidelines is recommended

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

***Please rate the BODY of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

***Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

***Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, no revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Good luck!

-----

-----  
Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

-----  
**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

Evaluation:

Title: Identity Resilience and Professional Project Reconstruction Among Internally Displaced Youth: The Case of Young People Settled in the Central Region of Burkina Faso

Yes — the title is clear, specific, and fully aligned with the article’s scope and content. If the author wishes to increase international readability, a minor stylistic refinement slightly could be:

Identity Resilience and Professional Reconstruction Among Internally Displaced Youth in Burkina Faso’s Central Region

This revision removes “project” (which is implied by “professional reconstruction”) and shortens the title without losing conceptual accuracy. However, the original version is already entirely acceptable and publication-ready for the European Scientific Journal.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

Yes — the abstract effectively and clearly presents the study’s objectives, methods, and results, meeting publication standards for the European Scientific Journal. To fully satisfy international abstract standards (200–250 words), add a short concluding sentence such as:

“Findings highlight the critical role of psychosocial support and skill recognition in fostering adaptive resilience among displaced youth, offering implications for policy and vocational programs.”

Otherwise, the abstract is clear, complete, and publication-ready for the European Scientific Journal.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

Correct — while the article is overall well written and academically sound, there are a few minor grammatical and spelling inconsistencies that should be corrected before publication. None affect clarity or meaning, but editing for fluency and consistency would improve readability and align it fully with European Scientific Journal standards.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Yes — the Methods section is clearly explained and meets the qualitative research standards expected for publication in the European Scientific Journal (ESJ). It demonstrates methodological transparency, coherence, and rigor. Only minor language polishing (tense consistency, article usage) may be needed, but no substantive revision is required.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

Mostly correct — the body of the paper is clear, logically structured, and free from major conceptual or methodological errors. The argumentation follows a coherent progression from introduction to discussion, making it well-suited for publication in the European Scientific Journal. However, a light language and formatting edit would further refine clarity and fluency. Only minimal stylistic editing (grammar, punctuation, and tense uniformity) is recommended before final submission. Once proofread, the manuscript will meet the European Scientific Journal's publication standards for clarity and precision.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

Yes — the Conclusion is accurate, coherent, and fully supported by the content of the study. It clearly synthesizes the main findings, reflects the empirical evidence presented, and appropriately connects the results to theoretical and practical implications. Only minor stylistic tightening (e.g., shortening long sentences and ensuring consistent past tense) may be helpful for readability. Still, no substantive revision is required for publication in the European Scientific Journal.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

Yes — the reference list is comprehensive, current, and appropriate for the study's theoretical, methodological, and contextual scope. It meets the expectations for qualitative research publication in the European Scientific Journal (ESJ). Only minor technical revisions (retrieval phrasing, access dates, uniform italics) are advised before final submission.

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

***Please rate the BODY of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

***Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

***Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

## **Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

### **Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

This study offers a valuable and timely contribution to the psychological and vocational understanding of internally displaced youth in West Africa. The integration of identity resilience theory, narrative reconstruction, and vocational adaptation provides a sophisticated conceptual framework rarely applied to this population. The analysis is rich, well supported by participant quotations, and theoretically informed without becoming abstract. The manuscript's clarity, depth, and cultural grounding make it suitable for an international audience. This article is well-conceived, competently executed, and theoretically rich. It effectively bridges the fields of identity psychology, resilience studies, and applied social research in humanitarian contexts. With minor stylistic and formatting refinements, it is fully ready for publication.

-----

-----

Reviewer D:

Recommendation: Resubmit Elsewhere

-----

#### **The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The title is concise, informative, and accurately reflects the paper's focus on identity resilience and professional reconstruction among displaced youth. It clearly represents the study's scope and aligns well with the manuscript's content.

#### **The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The abstract effectively outlines the purpose, methods, and main findings, though it could better emphasize the study's originality and implications. Adding one or two sentences connecting the findings to broader international contexts would strengthen it.

#### **There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

The manuscript is generally clear, but there are several grammatical inconsistencies and awkward sentence constructions. The style suggests partial AI-assisted phrasing. Careful proofreading by a fluent English speaker is recommended.

#### **The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The methodology is clearly presented and appropriate for the qualitative nature of the study. The use of grounded theory and consensual qualitative research principles is well justified.

#### **The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

The paper is logically structured and flows well. However, it occasionally relies on descriptive rather than analytical discussion, and integration with recent literature from Western contexts is limited.

#### **The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

The conclusions are consistent with the data and highlight the practical and theoretical relevance of the findings. Nevertheless, stronger linkage to international resilience frameworks would increase its broader significance.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The reference list is well formatted and relevant but lacks recent (post-2020) international sources. Adding recent studies would strengthen the literature base.

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the BODY of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Return for major revision and resubmission

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Dear author(s),

The paper presents a rich qualitative exploration of identity resilience and professional reconstruction among internally displaced youth in Burkina Faso. The study's focus is timely and relevant, addressing a pressing humanitarian and psychological issue. The methodological framework, grounded in interpretative phenomenological analysis and inspired by Consensual Qualitative Research, is well justified and clearly articulated. The work displays coherence between theoretical framing and empirical findings, with appropriate ethical considerations reported and adherence to institutional approval and informed consent procedures. These are strong elements supporting its academic rigor.

However, the manuscript requires major revisions before it can be considered for publication. The main concern lies in the lack of engagement with recent international and Western literature.



Much of the cited work, though foundational, is dated (e.g., Dubar 1998; Bandura 2006; Braun & Clarke 2006). To situate the findings within broader academic discourse, the literature review and discussion should include updated studies from the past five years, especially those examining post-conflict resilience, displaced youth, and professional identity development in comparable contexts. It is also suggested that the authors consider the following studies to enhance the intro and LR sections of the present study.

The methodology is well-structured, yet the results section at times reads more like an extended narrative illustration than an analytic synthesis. Greater integration between empirical data and theoretical interpretation would strengthen the paper's contribution. The discussion could better highlight how these findings expand or challenge existing resilience frameworks, moving beyond confirmation of prior models.

Regarding language, the paper is overall understandable but shows signs of AI-assisted phrasing—syntactically correct but overly uniform, with mechanical transitions and repetitive rhetorical patterns typical of machine-generated text. If generative AI tools were used (e.g., ChatGPT, Gemini, Claude), this should be disclosed, as such use is not permitted under standard academic publication ethics. Independent proofreading by a fluent English speaker or professional editor is also needed to refine awkward phrasing and ensure idiomatic fluency. Ethical aspects are clearly stated, with informed consent and psychological support protocols described in adequate detail. No ethical issues appear outstanding. However, it would strengthen transparency to specify the approval reference number or institutional review protocol if available, as many journals require this information.

In summary, the study has genuine potential and presents a socially meaningful contribution. Yet, it requires deeper engagement with recent international research, more analytic integration of qualitative findings, and thorough language revision. Given these points, I recommend major revisions rather than desk rejection. With improved academic contextualization and linguistic polishing, the manuscript could reach publishable quality.

With regards,

-----