

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_130938
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing Social Media Influence on Nigerian Youths’ Knowledge, Awareness and Attitude Towards Anti-Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) Legislative Provisions
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 his/her feedback here)</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.	Very important topic, still valid for the scientific community especially regarding the WHO purpose of ending FGM by 2030	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Abstract is fine	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Please see my comment below	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Please see my comment below	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Please see my comment below	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<div>Reviewer Report</div> <div>Title: Assessing Social Media Influence on Nigerian Youths’ Knowledge, Awareness, and Attitude Towards Anti-Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) Legislative Provisions</div> <div>General Assessment: This manuscript explores the influence of social media on Nigerian youths’ knowledge and attitudes toward legislative provisions against female genital mutilation (FGM). The study is timely and relevant, given the ongoing struggle to curb FGM despite legal prohibitions. The research design, methodology, and theoretical foundation are generally sound; however, several areas require improvement.</div> <div>Major Comments:</div> <div><div>1. Theoretical Framework:</div><div><div>The application of the Knowledge Gap Theory is appropriate, but the discussion could benefit from further exploration of how different social media algorithms influence exposure to information on anti-FGM laws.</div><div>Consider incorporating insights from studies that analyze digital media influence on public policy awareness and legal literacy.</div></div><div>2. Literature Review:</div><div><div>The literature review provides a good background on FGM and its legislative context but lacks discussion on how social media campaigns have influenced legal awareness in other contexts.</div><div>Relevant references such as PMID: 37092620 and PMID: 37568070 should be cited to strengthen the discussion on digital interventions for social issues.</div></div><div>3. Methodology:</div><div><div>The use of online surveys is justified given the study’s focus on social media users. However, there should be a clearer explanation of how sample selection accounts for digital literacy disparities.</div><div>Response rate and potential biases should be discussed in more detail.</div></div><div>4. Results and Discussion:</div><div><div>The results are presented clearly, but the discussion should link findings more explicitly to existing literature on digital activism and legal awareness.</div><div>There is a contradiction in stating that 63.7% of respondents are aware of anti-FGM laws, yet a majority lack knowledge of the legal consequences. A more nuanced interpretation is needed.</div></div><div>5. Recommendations:</div><div><div>The recommendations are practical, but a stronger emphasis on collaboration with digital advocacy groups would add value.</div><div>The potential for social media misinformation or misrepresentation of legal provisions should be acknowledged.</div></div></div> <div>Minor Comments:</div> <div><div>The manuscript contains minor grammatical errors and occasional redundancy; careful proofreading is advised.</div><div>Figures should have clearer captions to ensure accessibility.</div><div>The discussion should explicitly differentiate between ‘awareness’ and ‘knowledge’ to avoid ambiguity.</div></div> <div>Conclusion: This is a valuable contribution to the literature on social media and legal awareness, but revisions are necessary to enhance theoretical depth, methodological clarity, and contextual</div>	

Review Form 3

	<p>engagement. The suggested citations will help ground the study within a broader research landscape.</p> <hr/> <p>Actionable Recommendations for Authors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">1. Expand the literature review to incorporate insights from PMID: 37092620 and PMID: 37568070.2. Clarify methodology regarding sample selection and potential biases.3. Strengthen discussion by explicitly linking findings to previous research on digital legal literacy.4. Refine recommendations to address misinformation and collaborative approaches.5. Conduct thorough proofreading to address minor language issues. <p>By addressing these points, the manuscript will significantly improve in clarity, impact, and contribution to the field.</p>	
--	---	--

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alessandro Libretti
Department, University & Country	Univesity Hospital Maggiore della Carita', Italy