

## Review Form 1.8

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJTDH_120171</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>ATTITUDE AND PRACTICE OF FEMALE GENITAL MUTILATION AMONG WOMEN OF REPRODUCTIVE AGE IN A TERTIARY HEALTH FACILITY IN BENIN CITY, EDO STATE.</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 1.8

### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)	<b>Yes this is a very interesting article and well researched, offering insights into how various socio-cultural attitudes shape the continuation of a harmful practice.</b>	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes.	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	<b>Yes. Would make the discussions section longer.</b>	
<b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> (Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)	<b>Yes.</b>	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>	<b>Yes good</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	I feel that the Discussion section should discuss and describe the findings (which initially appear in tables) in a more spacious way. I feel these are rushed through. Each finding deserves at least a couple of lines, and each table's findings at least a paragraph. They should have been present in the background /introduction/literature review section of the paper.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	I would recommend that this is attended to (the discussion section re-written) and that the paper be accepted for publication (with minor revisions).	

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Thelma Mort</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of South Africa, South Africa</b>