

Review of: "Discussing Female Genital Mutilation by youth health care professionals in the Netherlands: facilitators and barriers"

Afi Agboli¹

¹ Université Catholique de Louvain

Potential competing interests: The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

Review

These recommendations are for modification/improvement for the author:

Importance of submission:

The title is well thought out and well-focused. I suggest: Discussing Female Genital Mutilation among youth health care professionals in the Netherlands: facilitators and barriers.

The paper is relevant and has critically important findings on the facilitators and barriers as far as FGM is concerned. The paper is very well thought out and reads very well. The research objectives are well stated. This study makes a meaningful and strong contribution to qualitative research literature. The paper is useful for readers and practitioners. Nonetheless, I have a few comments.

Theoretical orientation:

The theoretical part reads well. The authors focused straight to what has been done in the field, what gap they have found, and what they want to research on.

Methods:

The objective and the design of the study are well stated. However, there is a need to describe the setting and the process of recruitment. How did the analysis come about? What did the authors do? Explaining well these processes is what characterises qualitative research. The approach used in the data collection needs clarification. How did the authors actually decide saturation point was achieved (was there an agreement amongst authors etc)?

There is a need also for more details on the consenting process and to include some source of bias if there was any. How were they addressed? And self-biases, how were they addressed in the study?

Ethical considerations not specified.

Findings: Does the analysis of data reflect depth and coherence? In-depth descriptive and interpretive dimensions? Creative and insightful analysis? Linked with theory? Relevance to practice/discipline?

Characteristics of the participants: The characteristics of the participants are well presented in a table.

Findings: are well supported with verbatims except for the last emerged theme.

Discussion:

The results are linked to the literature. It makes a good contribution and implications for practice are discussed.

Manuscript style and format: Length (as short as possible], organization, clarity, grammar, appropriate citations, etc.); presentation of diagrams/illustrations?

The manuscript's length is fine, it reads well. However, a few grammar mistakes or vocabulary mistakes for example the expressions like "pop up" and university teacher" are not quite academic words. Otherwise, well done! All the best!