

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Study of individual and contextual factors associated with malaria in children aged 6–59 months in Burkina Faso: evidence from the 2017–2018 malaria indicator survey

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Richard Brou Yapi

Submitted on: 16 Sep 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1605347

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The study dealt with malaria in infants in Burkina Faso using a well-structured database. The study demonstrated, this frange of the population is still the most affected by the disease. The authors had used comprehensive statistical analyses to demonstrated the main leading cause of malaria occurence. Some factors such as the family socioeconomic, access to care and place of living were positively associated to malaria case in children.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Limitation:

- The authors acknowledged the movement of people due to political unrest within the country but, they did not take this fact when analysing their data.
- Poor English, this is not meant to deny the effort the authors made neither to undermine their work.

Strength:

- this is a sound statistical analyses using a malaria national database
- The method is well-described

Q 3 Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

The study is very well-designed and the analyses were well described.

my comments: Please, provide a map of country with its administratives boarders as described in the manuscript, health facilities, rural and urban setting and highlighting areas with political ans social unrests.

When describing your methods and results, always use past tenses. example: lines 54, 149, just to name few

The English language should be revised thoroughly

Line 126: BF is located in Sub-Saharan Africa with a superficie of 272,200 Km²

Line 137: Which instead of Whose

Line 147: One in five children: should One over five or one fifth

Line 170: do you mean children who had received blood transfusion??? not clear the way is written

Line 192: percentage of frequencies (both are the same, use one)

Line 53: 43% lower risk while the odd ratio is 0.59, there is a mistake, please correcte the OR

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

No answer given.

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

- Child should be replace by children under five years
- Multilevel regression should be replace by logistic regression
- Determinants should be removed

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

The English language need a lot improvement, preferably, should undergo a proof reading by native English speaker

Q 7 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

Q 8 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?)

Sounds acceptable

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9 Originality



Q 10 Rigor



Q 11 Significance to the field



Q 12 Interest to a general audience



Q 13 Quality of the writing



Q 14 Overall scientific quality of the study



REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Minor revisions.