

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_82923
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing Female Genital Mutilation Practice in South-Western Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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>Compulsory REVISION comments Methodology is not clear Result and conclusion section needs revision</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This cross-sectional study aims to examine the FGM practice and associated factors in a region with high FGM prevalence area. It is unclear what additional new evidence it brings to existent research and surveys conducted in area. 2. FGM should be used consistently throughout the paper. Circumcision should be avoided. 3. The written English in general needs to be strengthened. Flow of and syntax of sentences in several areas. The use of capitalization, non-clear sentences, using informal English words etc 4. Abstract is incomplete The abstract summarizes the study however presents the uninteresting results that does not make it stand out. DHS surveys have shown this before. Authors need to consider different descriptive analysis to present. 5. References are old and most of them are reports not articles. 6. Tables are not sited in body part 7. FGM and circumcision used interchangeably and they are not the same. <p>Method section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study area was not clear so it could be stated. How many administrative regions .? which region is selected.? How you can selected regions.? • Sampling procedure and Sample size determination was not stated • Inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants should be stated • Finding respondents is not mentioned so it could be described house to house or else visit... • Language translation, data collection language is not clear • Using English questionnaire for study is of concern. It will introduce non-consistency during data collection as English is not the national language and will depend on how "precise" data collectors translate questions in Amharic and interpret responses back into English questionnaire. Problematic area in design and can impact result and need to be addressed as a weakness. Currently addressed as a strength. • FGM is subjective response of respondent so how social desirability bias was handled , it can be mentioned • Not sure why it is mentioned that P=0.25 was "significant" to select variables into multivariate model, however looking at result they used P=0.05 which is OK. • Questioner development is not clear adopted , adapted .? <p>Result section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main aim of the study is practice of FGM is not described clear in order to to answer this much women's are undergone FGM in study area • Need to be concise in presenting results table wise and ITS content. What is there a sentence reporting on "daughters were age between 15 -49". Is the study on daughters or women? 	

Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How knowledge is measured. The author measured the knowledge in result part but in methodology section authors not stated knowledge measurement scale • The results could be more concise, • Not clear why some variables were selected as clearly some did not have statistical significance? What were the confounders? Were they defined and on what basis? • The table do not seem to meet any journal requirements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In table frequency and percentage is one column it is good if in separate column • It is not clear if IRB was received for this study. It should be clearly stated <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The discussion section data - data comparability in other settings is OK. • However, the interpretation of data needs strengthening - one example is age and FGM correlation, it is not about growing older and “deciding” to not have FGM performed. This reason given conflicts with data generated as the parents are the decision makers and does this to their daughters early in life, thus FGM prevalence in younger age groups is a function of the parent’s decision making not daughters. Secondly, it is a cross-sectional study and has limitations on ‘causality” with respect to age. • Needs revision, to explain why there are differences in study findings compared to others. One suggested reason for a finding is incorrect. Study limitations not addressed. Findings that were unique to this study were not highlighted and areas for further research not mention. • No conclusion section in the papers. No conclusion, ends abruptly.. <p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs to be strengthened based on the data generated. Education and values will need to be examined further. “Good tradition” needs to be unpacked more to understand why they perceive this a good tradition to develop interventions. Examine how education affects decision making etc. It may be ambitious to conclude that study results can be used for interventions. The results of this study point to more areas that need to be studied further/unpacked to develop interventions. <p>Recommendations should be complete</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments Title and introduction must revised</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title: assessment of some socio-cultural and economic factors associated to FGM; unless it can involve all determinants of FGM in result. 2. Add year of study and study design 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bargude Balta Anjulo
Department, University & Country	Hawassa University, Ethiopia