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Reviewer's report:

1. Major Compulsory Revisions:
   a. Since one of the major objectives of this study is to describe the rape survivors' characteristics, the use of a figure (i.e. fig 1) here rather than a table is not appropriate. Though figures give instant visual aid however a lot of necessary information cannot be depicted. A table to show victims socio-demographic characteristics i.e. age-group, gender (this paper has assumed that only females are victims), occupation (only student cadre (74.2%) was mentioned in the result; what about the other 25.8%.

   b. The data for the bivariate analysis used for the statistical test of significance for rape during the day versus at among teenagers and non-teenagers should be supplied.

   c. The p value given (p=0000) is incorrect; there is an omission of a decimal point. It would best be reported as p<0.001 if data supports this since you cannot have a value of just 0.

   d. Inferences should be drawn from results as regards means of accomplishing one of the aims stated i.e. reducing the overall incidence of rape - this has not been cleared stated and discussed.

   e. The major limitations of the study should be discussed especially the limitations imposed by the use of this type of study design (retrospective study)

2. Minor Essential Revisions:
   a. In the Background section:
      i. Sentence in paragraph 1 needs the reference to be supplied
      ii. After the definition of rape, the sentence that followed ... "it involves lack of consent;..." needs the reference to be supplied also.

   b. Under Results section:
      i. Paragraph 4, conventionally, sentences should not start with the use of a figure, either use a prefix or spell it out completely
      ii. Paragraph 5, the sentence should read thus... "There was neither referrals for psychotherapy nor was forensic specimen collected..."
c. Under Discussion:
  i. The prevalence of 0.76% should be defined as prevalence among hospital gynecological admissions for the period under review
  ii. Paragraph 1, the authors seem to be using incidence and prevalence interchangeably which should not be so. Then the figure quoted there is also wrong - 0.72% instead of 0.76%.
  iii. Paragraph 3, children 10yrs and < were actually almost 40% (39.0%) and not 50%

d. Figures and Tables:
  i. The figures should be supplied with appropriate titles under them.
  ii. Figure 1 has no labels for both X and Y axis
  iii. Table 2 - results should be arranged in descending order
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