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Reviewer's report:

1. It is not clear how long the national campaign for Saleema was carried out before the evaluation of the same was conducted. This information needs to be provided because it will give the reader an indication of whether there was sufficient time for any expected behaviour change.

2. While the use of the word FGM may be politically correct, it is value laden and may not be culturally appropriate. FGC is less stigmatising and culturally neutral for those who engage in the practice it (An edited book by Bettina Shell- Duncan and Ylva Hernland (2001) "Female "Circimcision" in Africa: Culture, Controversy, and Change" would be very helpful).

3. Methodology: Given that this was an evaluation study where different groups (eg. young, old, education, how many were mixed etc). It is important to know how these FGDs were distributed to assess how they reacted to the campaign messaging and activities the authors evaluated. From the conclusion section, a variable such as age seems important, yet it is given less weight in the constitution of the FGDs.

4. Results: The conventional way is to write words in full not symbols (eg. &). The authors need to check the quotations to be sure they are grammatically correct. Some words are left out eg. 'be' pg 9. The authors say frequent channels used for information include internet. But no elaboration on who uses internet? What age, education levels etc? This is necessary to enable the reader to contextualise the findings.

Some quotations are too long they should be indented (pg.12).

5. Discussion: This should be more robust, rather than merely repeating what is presented in the results section. Discussion should compare findings of the current study with findings of other/similar studies or studies dealing with similar/same subject. This is entirely lacking in the discussion!
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