|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Journal Name: | [**Archives of Current Research International**](https://journalacri.com/index.php/ACRI) |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms\_ACRI\_132175** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **Gaps and Domains of Knowledge Among Students from a Public School in Paudalho/PE Regarding Sexually Transmitted Infections** |
| Type of the Article | **Original Research Article** |

|  |
| --- |
| **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 makes a significant practical and academic contribution to reinforce the prevention of sexually transmitted infections (STIs) among adolescents. The manuscript lays out the urgency of comprehensive sexual education to promote informed decision-making and prevent STI transmission. The results of many studies reveal students' lack of understanding of various STIs, STI transmission processes and prevention strategies, necessitating targeted interventions in school and family settings. This manuscript builds a foundation for policy makers and educators to develop evidence-based strategies that improve sexual health literacy among youngindividuals. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **None** |  |
| **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.** | **Phrases such as *"ensuring voluntary participation* ‘ and *’forms were administered individually at a pre- determined date and time* ” may not be necessary in the abstract, as ethical approval and methodological details are usually covered in the full article.** |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | The manuscript should more clearly establish the statistical analysis used (e.g., chi-square test, confidence interval). If statistical analyses were conducted, they should be explicitly detailed in the methods section. The limitations section should openly acknowledge the small school-only population.The operational definition of the knowledge gap should be more clearly presented in the background and discussed then what are the next steps?Researchers should explain why they used a cross-sectional design, why not another design? |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | Please add references to STIs in the US, Europe, or Africa |  |
| **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?** | Some sentences repeat the same idea in different ways and should be simpler so that they are easy to read. |  |
| **Optional/General** comments |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **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)* |  |

 **Reviewer details:**

 **Putra Apriadi Siregar, Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera, Indonesia**