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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** (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 paper contributes significantly to the scientific and public health communities by addressing a key but underexplored element of adolescent health in Ghana: awareness and practice of self-breast examination (SBE) among female senior high school students. This study has the potential to inform measures that empower young women and, eventually, improve breast cancer outcomes in similar resource-constrained situations by providingbaseline data for focused policy and curricular development. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The article's title, "Self Breast Examination Among Female Students in Sunyani Senior High School," is generally appropriate since it clearly describes the study's primary focus: examining knowledge, attitudes, and practices related to self-breast examination (SBE) among a specific demographic.However, for greater clarity and academic rigor, consider a slightly updated version that more accurately reflects the study's scope and methodology.Like the one below: "Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices of Self-Breast Examination Among Female Students at Sunyani Senior High School, Ghana" |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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 of the paper is normally extensive, containing the following basic components: background, objective, methodology, findings, and conclusion. However, there are a few areas for improvement in terms of clarity, precision, and adherence to scientific writing standards.Explains the background and public health significance of SBE.* Identifies the study's objective.
* Describes the study's design and participants.
* Highlights important findings about knowledge, attitudes, and practices.
* Offers a conclusion with concrete advice.

Suggested Improvements: While the existing language "female students aged 15 to 19 years" is good, mentioning "**adolescent female students at Sunyani Senior High School**" in the Methods section will better connect the abstract to the study setting.The statement "Targeted, culturally sensitive educational interventions integrated into school curricula..." issignificant, but it may be **condensed for clarity**. |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | The manuscript's essential design, methods, and results interpretation are all scientifically valid. However, a few issues could be corrected or enhanced to improve scientific rigor and clarity.Scientific Strengths:* The study's objective is clear: to analyze female students' knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors (KAP) on self- breast assessment.
* A descriptive cross-sectional strategy is appropriate for measuring prevalence and relationships in KAP investigations.
* Data collection and analysis: The organized questionnaire is consistent with the research aims, and descriptive statistics are employed appropriately to summarize findings.
* Use of references: The work is well-cited, with contemporary and relevant material supporting the context and analysis.

Areas for Improvement:* The term “Self-Brest Examination” appears several times with a typo and should be corrected to “**Self-Breast Examination**.”
* Minor inconsistencies in reporting: In the demographic section, age categories and percentages appear slightly mismatched (e.g., 10.7% under 14–17 vs. 31.6% 16–17).
* The manuscript only uses descriptive statistics and does not include any inferential analysis. **Inferential statistics** (such as ***chi-square tests*** for connections between demographics and SBE practices) would increase scientific value and allow for more in-depth insights.
* Limited operational definitions: Definitions of “adequate knowledge,” “positive attitude,” or “good practice”

should be more explicitly defined in the methodology to improve replicability.* Overgeneralization in conclusion: While the study’s implications are valid, the conclusion occasionally generalizes beyond the scope (e.g., suggesting broader national outcomes from a single-school study). It would be more scientifically sound to acknowledge the limited generalizability due to the school-specific sample.
 |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | The references in the manuscript are generally adequate, current, and relevant. The majority of the mentioned articles were published between 2018 and 2025, reflecting current research in areas such as breast cancer screening,self-breast examination (SBE), adolescent health behavior, and health education in low-resource settings. |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?** | The article's language and English quality are usually understandable and convey the key ideas; however, substantialediting is required to fulfill formal scholarly communication standards. While the manuscript is well-structured and follows a logical flow, there are a few flaws that influence clarity, professionalism, and readability. |  |
| **Optional/General** comments | The authors convincingly demonstrate the significance of early education and behavioral intervention in lowering long-term breast cancer risk. However, to improve the manuscript's quality and impact, the following broad recommendations are made:* Improve linguistic clarity and academic performance.
* Use inferential statistics (e.g., cross-tabulations, chi-square tests) to investigate relationships and provide analytical depth.
* Avoid making broad generalizations about the entire sample (for example, national-level claims based on one school).
 |  |
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|  | **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)* |  |
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