

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRNH_128970
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge And Behaviours Of Adolescents On Sexual And Reproductive Health And Rights In Selected Secondary High Schools In Ife Central Local Government Area
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/> Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Given the widespread accessibility of inappropriate information regarding sex and sexuality, this study is highly relevant in assessing the knowledge adolescents have, its impact on their behaviors, and ultimately on their sexual health. The sample size is substantial, making the findings applicable for generalization and a valuable reference for future research. However, the paper would benefit from additional clarity in the presentation of data. Implementing the suggested revisions will enhance the quality of the study, making it a stronger contribution to the field.	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is appropriate; however, including the country's name would enhance its relevance and make it easier for scholars seeking country-specific studies to identify and reference the work.	OK
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is well-crafted, providing a comprehensive overview by clearly outlining the objective, methodology, and key findings of the study. The last line on religious factors in the abstract is repetitive. It can be used retained at the end of the abstract and its previous usage can be deleted. Also it can be re written as 'Religious factors disapproving of adolescent sexual activity, cultural norms, and poor communication about sexual and reproductive health and rights were identified as key challenges'	Revised
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The author has made a commendable effort to maintain scientific rigor, but a few aspects could be improved for robustness: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Frequency Analysis: While the frequency of correct and incorrect answers is effectively detailed, the connection between these frequencies and the total score is missing, limiting comprehensive understanding. Tables and Descriptive Statistics: Tables are well-presented, but explanations, such as for "knowledge of contraception," lack alignment. The table provides question-wise frequencies, but the explanation discusses overall knowledge without clarifying the descriptive statistics used to convey the total impression. Inferential Statistics: The use of inferential statistics adds value, but the hypotheses tested and the rationale behind the choice of statistical tests should be explicitly stated for clarity. Figures: Figures require more detailed explanations to align with the narrative and provide clearer visual insights into the data. Scoring Methodology: Scoring knowledge with binary responses is reasonable, but grouping behaviors into binaries oversimplifies the data and loses the granularity necessary for nuanced interpretation. Threshold Definitions: Categorizing "good" and "poor" knowledge/behavior based on the mean score is problematic, as means are sensitive to outliers. Using predefined cut-off scores would provide more robust thresholds. 	Noted and effected Revision amended Effected
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are adequate; however, incorporating more recent publications could enhance the study's relevance and alignment with contemporary developments in the field.	Noted
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is simple. But needs more clarity in statements. The sampling methodology rather in text can be put in the form of a flow chart, a pictorial representation can enhance the paper.	ok
Optional/General comments		

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>	