Paper: **"Niveaux, Tendances et Déterminants de la Morbidité Palustre des Enfants de Moins de Cinq ans au Burkina Faso de 2010 à 2018"**

Corresponding Author: Tou Gnigassilaga Gildas

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ehouman Evans
Freelance Researcher, Côte d'Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Blinded

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: EHOUMAN EVANS	
University/Country: Freelance Researcher / Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 8/11/21	Date Review Report Submitted: 21/11/21
Manuscript Title: Niveaux, tendances et déterminants de la morbidité palustre des enfants de moins de cinq ans au Burkina Faso de 2010 à 2018	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 49.05.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/~~No~~	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/~~No~~ You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: 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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4**
The title is clear and match with the content of the article	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**4**
The abstract, clearly presents the object, the methods used and the results obtained.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
We only noticed spacing mistakes with punctuation marks related to percentage.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**2**
The study methods are not well documented. There is no reference to refer the statistical analysis used. There is no mention of the tools used for analyzing the data.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**4**
Result presented are clear.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**3**
The conclusion is too long some of the comment could have been used in a methodological chapter.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**3**
Some of the intext reference are not mentioned in the Reference at the end of the paper. Theses reference need to be insert before publication.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Dear Authors,

I congratulate you for your paper as it is a very interesting and useful contribution to have a better understanding of malaria current evolution on the most vulnerable people, I mean children of less than 5 years old. It' a paper which prove that Data-Driven Policy is a key aspect to improve people's live.

However, I noticed some methodological aspects that I would like you to take into account to have your paper published for a question of reproducibility. I encourage you

to give more details on the statistical tools and methods used. What statistical software was used to analyze the data? You talked about test of comparison, but you did not mention this test with the level of significance, for example what was the value of the p-value which was obtained allowing you to say that the difference is significative. And moreover, you talk about tests of comparison of rate (tests de comparaison des proportions), what are these tests in fact, did you check the assumption of normality? It could also be interesting to indicated the number before the percentage for each result expressed in percentage.

I also noticed that some of the in text citations are not in the refence at the end of the document, for example: Kaboré (2019) ; (Ngwé, 2014) (Longuépée, 2006). You could have used reference manager software like Mendeley which is free and very efficient to manage reference when writing paper.

I mentioned minor punctuations related to the space before the percentage sign.

I finally suggest you to dedicate acknowledgments to those you provided you the data for publication.

Once again, I congratulate you for your paper and I hope to have the final version published.

Kind regards,

Evans, E.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This article is original and very well written. Data-Driven policy is a key aspect to improve people's life based on past studies and data collected. They good a good job to use data which exist to explain the evolution of Malaria. This paper is of a great interest for public health as it is related to malaria which is still responsible of death in young children living in low-income countries.
Some methodological aspects need to be clarified before publishing for a question of reproducibility.
Kind regards,

E.E.