

**Paper: “Female Genital Mutilation: A Religio-cultural Sensitive Issue
Determining Maternal Healthcare Choices among Somali Women in Dadaab
Refugee Camp, Kenya”**

Submitted: 14 August 2022

Accepted: 15 May 2023

Published: 31 May 2023

Corresponding Author: Josephine Gitome

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n15p16

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Erjona Abazaj
Institute of Public Health, Tirana, Albania

Reviewer 2: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedures based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Erjona Abazaj	
University/Country: University of Medicine, Faculty of Technical Medical Science	
Date Manuscript Received: February 01, 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: February 02, 2023
Manuscript Title: Female Genital Mutilation: A Religio- Cultural Sensitive Issue Determining Maternal Health Care Choices among Somali Women in Dadaab Refugee camp, Kenya.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 64.08.2022	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

	Rating Result
<i>Questions</i>	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation)

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Dear authors,

I congratulate you on your work. In my opinion, I would like to give you some suggestions.

Firstly, your paper requires formatting. It is not necessary to use the space key on the keyboard to create a space at the beginning of the sentence, but you must use the TAB key which has this function.

The figures must be unified; you must choose the same shape for all the figures.

Be careful with the literature citations in the text, APA style is not used in all citations.

So unify the way of citations according to APA style for each reference in the paper

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I accept this paper, but minor revisions are needed before publishing.