

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJTDH_104694</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Assessment of Use of Medical Forensic Evidence in Investigation and Prosecution Process of Defilement Perpetrators, A Case Study of Ruiru Sub-County, Kenya</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijtdh.com/index.php/IJTDH/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Without a doubt, the manuscript is important for any scientific community because the findings seem to be empirical.</li> <li>2. Of course, the title of the article does not require any alteration or modification. It addresses a current practical reality.</li> <li>3. The abstract captures all the relevant ingredients that define an abstract. For example, it includes the objective, methodology, results, and conclusion. These are the pillars of an abstract.</li> <li>4. As the paper appears, the coherence explains the appropriateness of the subsections and the structure of the manuscript. However, there are some important missing subsections.</li> <li>5. This manuscript is scientifically correct because it seems to feature some essential steps that guide a scientific paper. For instance, the findings are empirical facts.</li> <li>6. To begin with, the author makes use of the Chicago Style of referencing. Even though, there is no universal consensus on the time interval of citation. Depending on the context of the study, the source(s) could be above 5 years if the study is entirely historical. In the case of the manuscript, the majority of the sources cited are current. And finally, the references are sufficient and therefore meet the threshold for a research paper.</li> <li>7. The Literature Review as an essential subsection is missing. Every research paper must capture a relevant literature review pertaining to the phenomenon under interrogation. It explains the researcher knowledge about the subject matter. It helps the researcher to identify gaps in the existing literature.</li> <li>8. From the introduction, it is thinkable that the author provided information that would account for or constitute the literature review. However, separating or detaching the literature review from the introduction is appropriate. Moreover, the introduction explains the background of the paper.</li> <li>9. Statement of the problem: This subsection is also missing. There is a rationale or motive for assessing any phenomenon. Either to ascertain the effectiveness or the challenges.</li> <li>10. Though not compulsory. However, the author (s) should have provided conceptual clarification of defilement in context. This may remove the ambiguity readers may encounter.</li> <li>11. The structure of the research title suggests a fundamental problem that the author seeks to remedy. Therefore, there is a need for a statement of the problem. Interestingly, it is among the scientific method that guides a search paper.</li> <li>12. The Objective of the Study cannot be expressed just as the title of the manuscript. It needs to be worked on so as to reflect or connect with the research questions. For instance, to identify the effectiveness of medical forensic evidence in the prosecution of defilement, to unpack the challenges associated with the use of medical forensic evidence in the prosecution of defilement, etc.</li> <li>13. Research Questions: This is also missing. According to the author's methodology, the questionnaire guided the case study. This implies the research questions considered one of the essential steps of the scientific paper.</li> <li>14. The author(s) mentioned the use of Focused Group Discussion and Key Informants as part of the data collection techniques. However, there is no indication or evidence of the use of these techniques in the paper.</li> <li>15. Sample of the questionnaire, focused Group Discussion, and Key Informant should be attached as the appendix.</li> <li>16. The discussion of the study: It is in the section the author(s) describes, analyses, and interprets their findings. The author(s) explain the significance of those results and tie everything back to the research questions. Unfortunately, there are no research questions. It is also observed that the discussion predominantly contained</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p>citations. This cannot be the case.</p> <p>17. Conclusion of the paper. This is another sub-section that is missing. Granted the author(s) captured the conclusion under the abstract of the paper. However, it must come at last after the discussion of the paper. In other words, it is impractical for an abstract to capture what is not essentially part of any research paper. Moreover, the conclusion should provide an answer to the title of the paper. For instance, the outcome of the assessment of medical forensic evidence.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the English language used by the author is suitable for any scholarship of the paper. However, there is a need to proofread the paper for corrections and clarify missing links between some of the sentences and paragraphs.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ambrues Monboe Nebo Sr.</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Liberia, Liberia</b>