

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_123176
Title of the Manuscript:	Short-term effect of PM2.5 on childhood pneumonia admissions in Ouagadougou Burkina Faso
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses the short-term effects of PM2.5 exposure on childhood pneumonia admissions in Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso, a topic that has been underexplored despite high levels of air pollution in the region. The study provides valuable insights into how environmental factors, such as air quality, can impact children's health, particularly in low- and middle-income countries where such data is scarce. Additionally, the findings highlight the vulnerability of children under five years old to pneumonia, emphasizing the need for targeted public health interventions. The research also suggests that factors like breastfeeding may mitigate the effects of air pollution on respiratory health, which could inform future health policies and practices. I appreciate this manuscript for its focus on a critical public health issue and its potential to guide future research and interventions. However, I would have liked to see a more detailed exploration of the mechanisms by which PM2.5 affects pneumonia admissions, as this could enhance understanding and inform preventive strategies.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract of the article provides a solid overview of the study's aims, methodology, and results. However, there are a few suggestions for enhancing its comprehensiveness: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify the Study Design: While the abstract mentions that it is a partial ecological study, it could benefit from a brief explanation of what this entails, particularly for readers unfamiliar with this design. 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Scientific Robustness of the Manuscript The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through several key aspects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive Data Collection: The study involved a substantial sample size of 2012 children under 15 years, with detailed sociodemographic and clinical data collected from hospital records. This enhances the reliability of the findings. Rigorous Methodology: The use of autoregressive integrated moving average (ARIMA) modeling for forecasting daily pneumonia admissions indicates a sophisticated statistical approach, allowing for accurate analysis of temporal trends in relation to PM2.5 exposure. Consideration of Confounding Factors: The manuscript acknowledges and controls for potential confounders such as temperature, humidity, and pre-existing health conditions, which strengthens the validity of the results. Contextual Relevance: The study addresses a significant public health issue in Burkina Faso, where PM2.5 levels exceed WHO recommendations. This relevance underscores the importance of the research in informing local health policies and interventions. These elements collectively contribute to the scientific integrity of the manuscript, making it a valuable addition to the literature on environmental health and childhood pneumonia. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	Study population The study involved 2012 children including 1098 boys (54.6%) and 914 girls (45.4%). The children were aged between 0 and 180 months or ≤15 years. Of the 20212 children , 776 (38.6%) were admitted for pneumonia. Please revise the total number population included in the research!!!	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Getahun Mekuria Abera
Department, University & Country	Debre Berhan University, Ethiopia