



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART A:

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/IJTDH/1683
Title of the Manuscript:	THE PATTERN OF FEMALE GENITAL MUTILATION IN PORT HARCOURT, SOUTHERN NIGERIA

(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper)



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART B: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected' if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
General comment:	Although this manuscript is interesting particularly with the results of a downward trend in FGM, it is poorly written. It almost appears that the author cut and pasted information into manuscript format and left out the needed descriptions of significant information for the reader. The references are outdated. I did not see where an IRB either for the university or the hospital was obtained.	corrected
Specific comments:	Specific comments: 1. Failed to describe the 4 types of FGM for the reader, although I am aware of the different types (1-4) an average reader does not know the differences and therefore the importance of the research is nullified. 2. The education levels are not common knowledge for all readers. The author should include what each level is therefore giving more meaning to the sample population. The author needs to take into consideration the audience for the article. 3. Did the researcher have IRB approval? This raised ethical reason. 4. There are at least 9 references that are outdated. I understand using historical information for some of the information but there are multiple recent articles that the author could have used. An example of outdated information use is on lines 45-49 where the information is from an article 1997 (the enormity of the problem). That information is 15 years old.	Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected



SDI Review Form 1.5

	Additionally the books used (Oguntuyi 1979 and Tindal 1987 are not historical in nature and should not be used. The information from the World Health Organization is old. 5. Figures 1-4 are not necessary; they do not add anything to the manuscript. 6. I was particularly interested in the fact that over half of those subjects circumcised had it done during infancy. I would like to see more information on this as this practice negates rite to womanhood rational. This is a pattern that I have not seen before or at least not discussed before. Is it related at all to male circumcision?	Figures 1-4 have been removed.
--	--	---------------------------------------



SDI Review Form 1.5

Title and abstract	Appropriate title and abstract	
Introduction (<i>Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?</i>)	Missing information to lead the reader see my specific comments	corrected
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	No	corrected
Materials & methods (<i>Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work</i>)	cross-sectional study was appropriate but I would have like to see more descriptive analysis on the responses from the interviews.	corrected
Results & discussion (<i>Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?</i>)	Please see my overall comments about the manuscript	corrected
Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?	No mention of IRB although they mention the subjects agreed to participate	corrected
Conclusion (<i>Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only</i>)	The author does talk about patterns but does not emphasize them. I would like to see more information related to the patterns	corrected
References	References: there were 9 outdated articles that should not have been used. The other outdated articles were historical in nature and could be used. I found a number of other articles that could improve the manuscript. The following are articles I found to be helpful: Braddy, C & Files, J. (2007) Female genital mutilation: cultural awareness and clinical considerations. <i>Journal of Midwifery Women's Health</i> 52,(2): 158-163. <i>Pediatrics</i> (2010) Ritual genital cutting of female minors. 125 (5); 1088-1093	corrected



SDI Review Form 1.5

Toubia, N & Sharief, E (2003). Female genital mutilation: Have we made progress? *International Journal of GynaecologyObstetric*.

Krause, E., Brandner, S. Mueller, M. & Kuhn, A (2011). Out of Eastern Africa: Defibulationa and sexual function in woman with FGM. *The Journal of Sexual Medicine*