



Paper: “Fertility Transition in Burundi: Contribution of Individual and Contextual factors among Women in Union”

Submitted: 02 June 2025

Accepted: 04 August 2025

Published: 31 August 2025

Corresponding Author: Emmanuel Singoye

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n23p34

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Josephine Gitome
Kenyatta University, Kenya

Reviewer 2: Nicholas Otieno
Pwani University, Kenya

Reviewer 3: Tèko Augustin Kouevi
University of Abomey-Calavi (UAC), Republic of Benin

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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!

Date Manuscript Received: June 27, 2025	Date Review Report Submitted: July 18, 2025
Manuscript Title: Fertility transition in Burundi: contribution of individual and contextual factors among women in union	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0645/25	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Not necessarily	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

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.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments) The content of the paper indicates that it relates to the “assessment of the factors affecting women’s fertility between 2010 and 2016/2017”. Meanwhile, the actual title sounds as coming out of the blue.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments) The abstract is well structured. However, it can still be sharpened via the quality of the writing.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments) The writing may be polished to easy reading and understanding here and there, as indicated in my comments.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Authors managed to explain the study methods as much as possible. However, the relevance of most of the variables used and measured in the study are not accurately justified, neither are the processes towards their measurements. The data analysis methods also were poorly justified.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The study results could be better written. They are now presented as if the focus is on the methods used instead of on the subject matters (fertility trends and reasons behind such trends).	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The conclusion needs to be restructured to look as a proper conclusion.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): Authors need to read through the paper and revise where necessary to improve its quality. The quality of the writing needs to be improved for easy understanding.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: None

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 30 th June 2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 7 th July 2025
Manuscript Title: Fertility transition in Burundi: contribution of individual and contextual factors among women in union	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 45:06:2025	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: NO	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: YES	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: YES	

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.	2
At a glance, one is not very sure of the issue of what ‘fertility transition’ is all about. The words women in union are also not revealing the true meaning and one can only speculate what the author wish to communicate. I suggest a change of title to either; ‘The impact of individual and contextual factors on the fertility of women in marital union in Burundi from 2010-2025’ or ‘Fertility Reduction among Burundi Women in marital union from 2010 - 2025	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	
The objectives are missing in the abstract, the method is well shared though with scattered statements. It is helpful if the writer can focus on methodology once and discuss all its details without interrupting the readers thought process with other information.	

3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
There are minor edits	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
They are explained but scattershot. A paragraph on methodology alone could help.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
They are good but there is room for improvement because of corrections in other areas of the paper.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4.5
Ok	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
Some of the references are too old, 1976 etc. The author can look out for current data on the same topics	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	x
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Is a good paper if only the Burundi DHS 2025 is included. If that happens the article will change in many parts because it will accommodate proper comparison and be up to date. 2017 is a cool 8 years ago.