

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_123414
Title of the Manuscript:	CHILD PROTECTION AWARENESS AMONG CHILDREN IN SELECTED SCHOOLS IN MUNALI CONSTITUENCY OF LUSAKA, ZAMBIA.
Type of the Article	Journal article

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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 his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I like is because it provides information about the least researched area of how informed children are in their protection. It provides insights on sources of information on child protection amongst children. The article uses a mixed methods approach to balance between qualitative and quantitative data. However, the article does not adequately address the (in)adequacy of child protection information by children as it is devoid of the indicators of such- in(adequacy)	noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	noted
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.	Yes, but it does not address the objective(s) or scope of the article.	Revised accordingly
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, they are appropriate but seem not to fully address the issues under study.	Revised accordingly
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article seems to be lacking on consistency in the presentation of findings section. The author(s) do not consistently present data (use of actual figures versus percentages). Though the research methods are appropriate, the methods section lacks justification for the selected methods of data collection and analysis. The article provides evidence of research, quotes appropriate literature and provide an interpretation of findings which needs to be improved.	Revised accordingly and various sections beefed up
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	There is a need to add more references, especially those depicting findings from other countries to clearly show a gap. The discussion part may need additional references. If not available, the author(s) need to be clear about it. Additional reference: Zambia's Children's Code Act 12 of 2022	Zambia's children's code act of 2022 added in the introduction

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes but it needs revisions as the author(s) need to use active voice. Get rid of wrong and misspelt words.	Edited accordingly
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Acronyms must be mentioned in full for first time usage.• Cite scholars directly, not through others.• What does the children's code act number 12 of 2022 say about child protection?• Any background information from other African countries or beyond do?• What sampling method was used before randomly sampling schools per ward? Was it cluster based? Readers should not be left to assume.• The researcher(s) claim that they received only 328 consents from the possible338. Whose consent was this? For parents? What about children, did they assent to participate in the study, or parental consent was enough?• The map may not need to be under the research methods section.• What research instrument was used for FGDs?• What do the demographic figures presented under the results section mean in the context of the study?• Author(s) need to proofread the document for proper usage of words, for instance, the word farm was used instead if form in one sentence.• Why was social welfare not part of the key informants? Or at least NGOs involved in child protection?• On section on findings, b (In)adequacy of knowledge on child protection - this can't be deduced by a simple yes or no question, it lacks depth. What is the indicator used to measure of in(adequacy) of knowledge on child protection?• Inconsistencies in data presentation- at times authors used figures and at some point, used percentages. The authors need to be consistent.• Presenting similar data in numbers and description takes space. There is need to interpret figures.• Data must be reported in past tense, not present continuous tense.• Authors need to be specific and not use words like few, most. Since this is mixed methods research, the discussion part must also be guided by percentages and figures.• As far as the study is about children, there was a need to engage parents. As it stands, the results show that children got information about their protection from parents. It is not known whether parents have adequate knowledge on child protection. Perhaps, a recommendation of further study on this can be made.• Inadequate data from FGDs was discussed.• The study is not clear of its objectives or scope in the introduction. It leaves the reader(s) to assume.• The study seems to be silent on legislative environment or issues affecting children's awareness on child protection. The recommendations need to touch on policy issues, theory and practice. The authors must note gaps in their study and provide recommendations for further study. There is need for a rigorous analysis and interpretation of findings.	Article revised accordingly and a number of these concerns have been addressed

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	The article has been extensively revised taking into account various comments from the reviewer. More details and data have been provided throughout the entire article from the abstract to the conclusion. The highlighted areas show this extensive revision