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| **PART 1: Comments** | | |
|  | **Reviewer’s comment**  **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **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.** | This manuscript is important to the scientific community because it addresses a critical gap in understanding the level of knowledge on Sexually Transmitted Infections among students in public school in Brazil. The manuscript also provides empirical evidence based on the demographics of male and female students who shows knowledge about the subject matter and those who do not. The article also acknowledges the openness in discussing STIs with parents and Guardians as the case maybe. | The entire team responsible for the development of this work would like to express our gratitude for the reviewers' feedback. Your evaluation is highly valuable for our improvement. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | From professional point of view, I think the title of the article can be a bit confusing as readers who are not familiar with variables would have to take a deeper reflection before grasping the real essence of the message, thereby making it ambiguous. I think the title should be clear and straight to the point since it is not the headline for a newspaper that requires readers to dig deeper, it is a research work. It is in line with this that suggest a title as thus:  “Knowledge Gaps and Educational Needs on Sexually Transmitted Infections Among Public School Students in Paudalho, PE”  From my suggestion, it present clarity and readability, because “Gaps and Domains of Knowledge” is a bit technical and could be simplified. Secondly, Educational Focus: Educational needs broadens the discussion beyond just identifying gaps. Finally, the revised  version is more fluid and aligns with academic and research writing conventions. | The suggestions were analyzed and completely implemented. |
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| **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-structured and informative, but there is a few refinements that could enhance clarity, coherence, and comprehensiveness. My suggestions are as follows:   1. The first sentence effectively introduces adolescence as a vulnerable phase but the author should consider linking this more explicitly to the research problem (e.g., "This vulnerability is exacerbated by a lack of adequate sexual education, increasing the risk of sexually transmitted infections (STIs).") 2. The aim statement is clear but could be slightly more precise. Instead of "identify and analyze the level of knowledge, the author should " consider "assess students’ knowledge gaps and misconceptions about STIs."    * The methodology section is well-explained, but the author could clarify:    * The sample selection process (e.g., Was it random, voluntary, or targeted?).    * The questionnaire's scope (e.g., Did it include knowledge, attitudes, and practices?).    * The ethical considerations beyond informed consent (e.g., privacy measures for sensitive responses). 3. The results section is strong, but it could benefit from:    * A clearer transition between general findings (STI knowledge) and specific concerns (misconceptions, condom use, and communication barriers).    * More emphasis on **practical implications** (e.g., how the findings relate to the need for structured sex education programs).    * If space allows, the author should briefly mention how gender differences in knowledge/attitudes were observed.   5. The conclusion is compelling but it could be more action-oriented. Instead of **"underscoring the urgency of educational actions,"** The author should consider emphasizing the **type of interventions** needed (e.g., school-based sexual health programs, family-oriented discussions, peer education initiatives). | Thank you for your thorough review. Your feedback is valuable for the team's improvement. The suggestions were analyzed and partially implemented. |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | The manuscript appears to be **scientifically sound** in its overall approach but may require further clarification in certain areas to ensure full accuracy and rigor. The study addresses an important public health issue—adolescents’ knowledge gaps regarding sexually transmitted infections (STIs)—which is a well-documented concern in the literature. The research design, data collection, and ethical considerations seem appropriate, as informed consent was obtained and a structured questionnaire was used.  However, some aspects of the methodology are not fully detailed in the abstract, such as the validation of the questionnaire, the sampling method, and any statistical analyses performed. While the results are presented clearly, additional details on how the data was analyzed and whether findings align with existing literature would strengthen the manuscript’s scientific credibility. | Thank you for your thorough review. Your feedback is valuable for the team's improvement. The suggestions were analyzed and partially implemented. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | The references are **largely sufficient and relevant**, but updating some older sources and the author should consider incorporating **additional epidemiological data and behavioral** | Thank you for your thorough review. Your feedback is valuable for the team's improvement. The suggestions were analyzed and partially implemented. |
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| **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?** | The manuscript’s English is **adequate for scholarly communication** but could benefit from **minor refinements for clarity, conciseness, and readability**. A professional **proofreading or language review** would help ensure fluency. | Thank you for your thorough review. Your feedback is valuable for the team's improvement. The suggestions were analyzed and partially implemented. |
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