



Manuscript Title:	Educational philosophies in crisis context: identity construction and resilience of future psychologists in Burkina Faso
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

EDITOR

Comments and Recommendations

Follow the suggestions of the reviewers and submit a response form that outlines any changes made in the manuscript following the suggestions. Ensure that each reference is legitimate and that the DOI is valid.

Reviewer 1

General Comments and Recommendations

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. Overall, this is a highly relevant and timely qualitative study exploring how future educational and vocational psychologists construct their professional identities during the security crisis in Burkina Faso. The conceptualization of reflexive resilience framing adaptability not as passive acceptance but as an active, critical negotiation with the environment is particularly compelling and adds real value to the literature on practitioner training.

Specific Comments and Recommendations

There is a major epistemological clash in the methodology that needs to be resolved. The manuscript states that you used reflexive thematic analysis, as defined by Braun and Clarke (2019). However, the next paragraph details the use of double coding and calculates inter-rater agreement, noting a Cohen's Kappa of 0.84. Braun and Clarke explicitly and repeatedly argue against using reliability metrics like Cohen's Kappa in reflexive thematic analysis. Their framework is rooted in a constructivist paradigm where researcher subjectivity is seen as an analytical resource, not a bias that needs to be controlled by consensus coding. You must either align your procedures with true reflexive thematic analysis and remove the inter-rater reliability metrics or rename your methodology to a more positivist approach, such as codebook thematic analysis.

For theme 2 in the results, you mention that navigating between Marcia's identity statuses becomes a necessity for survival. Please clarify in the text whether the students themselves articulated this kind of identity shifting, or if this is entirely your theoretical overlay applied to their pragmatic approach.

The "Author Contributions" section frequently references "All authors" and "The primary researcher". Ensure this aligns with the title page upon final submission. Additionally, please



clarify the role of the "two independent coders" thanked in the Acknowledgements versus the "two researchers" who conducted the double coding. It should be clear whether these individuals are considered co-authors or external assistants.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

Reviewer 2

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
<p>This manuscript addresses a very important and timely issue, and it has clear potential because the topic is meaningful, the context is urgent, and the participants' voices are strong. The paper also shows that the authors are trying to connect theory, training, and crisis reality in a serious way. My main comment, however, is about overall conceptual and evidentiary alignment. At present, the paper sometimes promises one thing, analyzes another, and concludes more than the interview data can safely carry. I think this is the one major issue that, once revised carefully, will improve the title, abstract, introduction, methods, results, discussion, conclusion, and even the reference use in one sweep.</p>

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
<p>Starting from the title, the phrase "educational philosophies" seems broader and more abstract than what the manuscript actually captures. Based on the interview excerpts and analytic flow, the paper is really more about professional identity formation, perceived training-field dissonance, reflexive adaptation, and anticipated psychosocial burden among psychology students in a crisis setting. Because of that, the current title may create a slightly misleading expectation. The same issue continues in the abstract. The abstract says the study analyzed educational philosophies, but the themes presented are not really philosophical positions in the classical or educational-theoretical sense. They are more like professional perceptions, identity negotiations, coping orientations, and anticipated practice tensions. I suggest the authors either redefine very clearly, early in the paper, what they mean by "educational philosophies" in this specific study, or revise the wording throughout so the paper does not overstate the nature of the construct.</p>
<p>This same alignment problem is present in the introduction. The background is interesting, but the paper moves across many layers quite fast: educational system collapse, educational and vocational psychology, identity construction, resilience, self-determination, occupational mental health, and vicarious trauma. These are all relevant, yes, but the manuscript currently reads as if it is trying to answer too many conceptual questions at once. As a result, the central object of inquiry becomes a bit blurred. Are the authors mainly studying educational philosophies, or</p>



identity construction, or resilience, or training adequacy, or anticipated trauma? Right now, all of them seem to compete for center stage. I think the introduction needs a firmer spine. The authors should identify one primary analytic focus and then position the others as supporting lenses, not as parallel outcomes. That will make the manuscript more coherent and more persuasive.

In the methodology, the same concern becomes more important because the paper presents a qualitative, reflexive thematic analysis, but some parts of the method description sound closer to coding-reliability logic from a different qualitative tradition. In reflexive thematic analysis, the emphasis is usually not on inter-rater agreement in the positivist sense, so the inclusion of double coding and Cohen's kappa may create theoretical tension unless the authors explain very clearly why they combined these procedures. Also, the claim of "data saturation" may need more caution, because reflexive thematic analysis often treats theme development as interpretive depth rather than saturation in a fixed sense. This does not mean the method is wrong, but the paper should be more careful and internally consistent in how it describes its analytic stance. At the moment, the manuscript says "reflexive thematic analysis," but some of its validity language suggests a different epistemological position. That should be cleaned up.

The results section contains vivid quotations, and that is one of the strengths of the paper. Still, the themes sometimes look more researcher-generated and rhetorically polished than directly grounded in the actual interview material. Terms such as "pedagogical survival," "identity bricolage," and especially "reflexive resilience" are interesting, but the paper needs to show more carefully how these labels arose from the participants' words and not mainly from the authors' interpretive framing. Related to this, some claims become quite expansive compared with the size and nature of the data. For example, the manuscript at times moves from student perceptions to broader conclusions about the profession, training systems, and crisis-practice realities. The data can support insightful interpretations, yes, but the wording should stay closer to what final-year students anticipated, perceived, or feared, instead of sounding as though the study has directly established field-wide realities. That distinction matters.

The discussion is where the overreach becomes most noticeable. The authors often interpret the findings in a thoughtful way, but some paragraphs read too confidently for a study based on 18 interviews with students from one center. The discussion would be stronger if it remained more proportionate to the evidence. For instance, the idea of a "hybrid professional identity" is convincing, but it should be framed as an emergent interpretation from this sample, not as a more general model unless the authors explicitly say it is provisional. The same goes for "reflexive resilience." It is a promising analytic concept, but the paper should present it more modestly, as a possible interpretive contribution, not yet as a firmly established construct. The conclusion should also be toned in the same direction. It is currently well written, but some lines sound broader than what the data can warrant.

Even the references reflect this same issue of alignment and caution. The reference list mixes foundational works with some very recent sources, but a few citations seem to be used more as conceptual reinforcement than as carefully matched support for specific claims. The authors should check that every citation really does the work assigned to it in the manuscript. Also, because the paper is being positioned for a scientific journal, the authors may need to verify all recent references very carefully, especially the newest 2025 to 2026 sources, and make sure they are accurate, traceable, and necessary. More importantly, the references should support a tighter argument, not a wider one. A more disciplined use of literature will help the paper stay focused.



Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

SECOND ROUND

<u>Decision</u>	<u>Editor</u>	<u>Reviewer 1</u>	<u>Reviewer 2</u>
Accept the manuscript for publication.	/	/	/
Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.			
Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.			