

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_115947
Title of the Manuscript:	Internally Displaced Persons and Socio-territorial Integration in the Commune of Kaya in Burkina Faso : what sustainable solutions to the crisis ?
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Decision: The area of research is important, title is correct and abstract is just OK.</p> <p>Abstract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> In abstract, the word hitherto may be replaced with “previously”. Correct sentence is “These IDPs have chosen 301 municipalities spread across the 13 regions of the country as destinations for refuge <p>Introduction Section</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> What is GAT and ATGs? These terms should be written in full with a short explanation followed by the abbreviation used where necessary. What is gendarmerie? A simple two words may be merged with it in a flow to clarify its meaning. See the sentence “.....strategies, [2] and [3]” and make corrections. What is the research gap? The last para of the intro section already mentioned the socioeconomic conditions of the community. It is suggested to rephrase the first research question by highlighting the research gap. In introduction section, according to the numbers of IDPs as of 2022, it means that about 6.1% of the total IDPs have taken refuge in Kaya. The researcher may mention this percentage figure to support or build his arguments. Socio-territorial integration covers strategies such as Promoting cultural exchange and understanding, Enhancing social interaction and communication, Encouraging community participation in decision-making, Developing shared public spaces and amenities, Implementing policies to address social inequalities etc. Which area is under consideration in the present research? The introduction section may mention these strategies and incorporate the selected strategies in the survey. Since the second question is about the possible durable solutions, it means that the author (s) wants to address this question from the socio-territorial integration of the IDPs. It is suggested to develop a link between the two questions by improving the write up. <p>Decision: This section should be rewritten in the light of the above suggestions.</p> <p>Methodology Section</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> It has been mentioned that “The surveys covered....”. How many surveys have been conducted? “Spatial sampling was carried out on 06 sites, including 2 manned IDP clustering sites and 4 uninhabited IDP clustering sites.” Justify the selection with proper explanation of the terms used. Methodology should be explained properly in the light of the objectives. <p>Decision: This section should be rewritten in the light of the above suggestions.</p> <p>Results and Discussion Section</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Rewrite these sentences – “The analysis resulted in results addressing the various research questions. These are (i) the living conditions and socio-territorial integration of IDPs, (ii) durable solutions to the forced displacement crisis in the commune of Kaya”. 	

Review Form 1.7

	<div>2. Rewrite section 3. as there are many syntax mistakes and lack of flow.</div> <div>3. Figure 1 should be explained properly. The author must explain the pre-existing situation of housing and provisions if any by the government in the cited area.</div> <div>4. “Access to livelihoods is a Chinese 'headache' for IDPs.” What is the objective of placing this sentence in the results of the study?</div> <div>5. It has not been explained that who is distributing and managing Aid in the study area? Please specify the aid agency and the kind of aid being provided or not provided.</div> <div>6. Font size in footnotes may be corrected as per the journal rules.</div> <div>7. Check the title of the figure- Fig 2. <i>Levels of health care care care of IDPs surveyed.</i> The graph options also need rephrasing. The fig. must not be left unexplained.</div> <div>8. It is worth mentioning here that the survey had been conducted in June 2021. The authors have not updated the status of IDPs for 2024 whether they are still there or have been returned back.</div> <div>9. Paragraph on education status needs complete revision to comprehend.</div> <div>10. Socio-territorial integration of IDPs in the commune of Kaya is the main part of the present study, however very little information has been provided on the subject. Who are the host communities and how the integration is working- has not been explained. The authors should work towards incorporating the types of Socio-territorial integration in the results. Also explain the living conditions of the host communities. In case they are also deprived of facilities, how then the integration is affected?</div> <div>11. It is mentioned in the results that “89.8%, who wish to return to their areas of origin...”. Explain why the rest of IDPs don’t want to return to their homes.</div> <div>12. The research could not provide durable solution as claimed by the author (s). Therefore, it is concluded that the research objectives have not been fulfilled. The survey has not been conducted properly covering gender, age, disability, profession related issues.</div> <div>13. The results and discussion have not covered the link between the two aspects of the study, i.e. the socio-territorial integration of the IDPs and the durable solutions.</div> <div>Decision: This section needs complete revision and is not acceptable in the present form. The survey is old, and does not contain required information as mentioned in the main frame of the study. To do the justice, survey may be designed again to address the research questions properly.</div> <div>Suggested References</div> <div>Murillo, F. (2017). Migrants and rapid urbanization: a new agenda for humanitarian and development urban planning. <i>New York: United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN-DESA)</i>, 03.</div> <div>Oginni, O. S. (2023). Return to normalcy: Transition and futures in insecure spaces. <i>Futures</i>, 153, 103239.</div> <div>Vergara Figueroa, A. (2011). Ripped from the Land, Shipped Away and Reborn: Unthinking the Conceptual and Socio-Geo-Historical Dimensions of the Massacre of Bellavista.</div>	
--	--	--

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No.	
Optional/General comments	The document contains red lines throughout, seems a converted version and difficult to read.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Naila Nazir
Department, University & Country	University of Peshawar, Pakistan