

Review of: "Assessing Sex Education Awareness Among Higher Secondary School Students in India"

Ervin Toçi¹

¹ University of Medicine, Tirana

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Manuscript title: Assessing Sex Education Awareness Among Higher Secondary School Students in India

Manuscript ID: Original Article DRX2CT

Comments to authors:

1. In Abstract

Comment: The abstract rarely starts with the aim of the paper. Rather, the aim is listed after a short introduction to the main problem being addressed by the manuscript. Therefore, the first sentence can be deleted and included in the methods section, rephrased naturally.

2. In Introduction

Comment: The Introduction section is unacceptably short. Therefore, the authors need to expand it much more, always focusing on the main topic this research addresses. The way the authors compile the Introduction section leaves a lot of room for freedom (either thematic driven, historical, from the general to the specific or vice versa, etc.). Please also provide references.

3. In Methodology

Comment: In Sample selection: please provide more information on the sampling framework, rather than just stating the sample size.

In Survey Instrument: please provide more information on how the questionnaire was developed; for example, how you selected the questions, did you create the questions from scratch, or did you take them from other ready-made instruments? Are there issues of reliability and validity? Did you pilot the questionnaire before applying it on a large scale? Etc....

Please remove the whole questionnaire from the manuscript body text. If you would like, you can attach it as an Appendix.

4. In Results

Comment: The authors have followed a rather “robotic” style to present their findings. I mean this: first, we see a list of tables, and then the description of the tables follows in, again, a robotic way, with bullets and points. Note that the results are rarely presented like this. For example, instead of listing 4 bullet points in Findings, Section 1: Demographic information, the authors could provide a narrative description of these 4 bullet points in a few sentences, in a paragraph. And so on with the description of the main findings from other tables.

5. In Discussion

Comment: Again, the discussion is formulated in an “unnatural” way by providing bullet points instead of text paragraphs where the actual findings are put in context and compared to findings from previous research. This section, and its 4 bullet points, look more like Conclusions rather than Discussion!

6. In Recommendations

Comment: Again, please stop listing bullet points to convey what you want to convey. Like this, it looks like you have just used ChatGPT to generate these bullet points!

The recommendations need to be based on your findings and your conclusions, whereas the actual recommendations go way beyond your findings!

Please correct and use a human (paragraphs, sentences, narrative text, etc.) to present your recommendations to the reader.

7. In Conclusions

Comment: The Conclusions section always precedes the Recommendations Section. In this case, just like I anticipated, the Conclusions are the same as the Discussion section. Therefore, the authors need to rewrite the whole Discussion section, then move the Conclusions section before the Recommendations section, again avoiding the bullet points and providing a narrative description, as I said earlier.

My final decision regarding this manuscript, based on its actual state: REJECT.

If the Editor would like to be softer, I would suggest MAJOR REVISIONS in all sections of the manuscript, according to the above comments.

Best!