SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

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:	**Two major comments:** **In order to support the argument that FGM is on the decline a temporal comparison should be more elaborated and explicit in the article. The decline in age as the data presents is an argument of second order and only implicitly point to the decline of FGM. Secondly, it is clear that the economic factor of rewarding the FG mutilator practitioners stands on the way of the struggle for the abolition of this malaise. I would suggest that the author expand on this point when bringing the governmental legal policy to the discussion.**	This was captured in the last paragraph of the discussion.
Specific comments:	The study points the prevalence of the FGM and its prevalence according to age. However, it does not elaborate on the socio-cultural patterns.	
Title and abstract	As the research does not present a study on socio-cultural patterns I suggest to omit the term 'patterns' from the title and accommodate the discussion in the text	This was highlighted in table 2 and elsewhere in the text including the discussion.
Introduction *(Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)*	the objective of this study is very important however, it is not accurately defined, especially the correspondence between the objective of the article and the discussion. The objective aims at measuring the change in the incidence of the FGM amongst women in Port Harcourt, South-South Nigeria but not the patterns. It should limit itself to that.	
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	I would suggest that the author refer to the following two studies: 1. Akulogu, J. (2000). Amnesty International Board Member interviewed for Ha'Aretz newspaper in Hebrew, February 4. 2. Henriette Dahan Kalev, "Cultural Rights or Human Rights: The Case of Female Genital Mutilation" *Sex Roles, Vol. 51, Nos. 5/6, September 2004 (c_2004)*	Could not find this reference https://www.academia.edu/3805923/sexroles_2
Materials & methods *(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)*	For the results of the study, the methods are sufficient on the condition that the author would meet the issue of the patterns as detailed above.	

Results & discussion (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?)	2. The references suggested above should enable the author to meet the point of relevance in the discussion. The statistical analyses are must for this paper on the condition the issue of patterns and the issue of incidence/time would be met.	
Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?	No	
Conclusion (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)	Partially, please see above comments. The conclusions are not biased but are partially based on the data.	
References	Akulogu, J. (2000). Amnesty International Board Member interviewed for Ha'Aretz newspaper in Hebrew, February 4. Henriette Dahan Kalev, "Cultural Rights or Human Rights: The Case of Female Genital Mutilation" *Sex Roles, Vol. 51, Nos. 5/6, September 2004 (c _ 2004)*	