

Manuscript: “**Les Facteurs Individuels Et Contextuels De Risque De L’anemie Chez Les Enfants De 6-59 Mois Au Burkina Faso**”

**Submitted: 03 May 2021**

**Accepted: 21 January 2022**

**Published: 31 March 2022**

Corresponding Author: **Karim Yelbi**

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n11p170](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n11p170)

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Christian NGOMENZEY MUSUYI, University of Kinshasa/ RD Congo

# *ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision. *ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!*

Reviewer Name: Christian NGOMENZEY MUSUYI	
University/Country: University of Kinshasa/ RD Congo	
Date Manuscript Received: 21 <sup>st</sup> June, 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 24 <sup>th</sup> June, 2021
Manuscript Title: INDIVIDUAL AND CONTEXTUAL RISK FACTORS OF ANEMIA AMONG CHILDREN AGED 6-59 MONTHS IN BURKINA FASO	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0559/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Excellent</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and</b>	<b>4</b>

<b>results.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The abstract is clearly presented</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>Article contains few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>Methods are goods</b>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>Results are goods</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>RAS</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The references are appropriate but not actual</b>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

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

To respect the plan of scientific paper:

1-Introduction

2-Data and Methods

3-Results

4-Discussion and conclusion

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

**RAS**