

Review of: "Who Is Responsible for Preventing Children's Sexual Harassment?"

Shiva Prakash Srinivasan

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Overall comments: It would be helpful to run the document through a software for assessing grammar. There are sentences which are hard to understand.

Abstract:

In the results section - "...models of responsibility for sexual harassment prevention were carried out in various stages..." does not appear to be a result, it appears to be more like a methodology statement.

In the conclusion: This is an extremely generic statement that does not capture any new information from this study.

Introduction:

- from the first line onwards, the numbers do not add up. There is a lot of repetition of information which detracts from the main points.
- Organizing the material to ensure that there is a flow will help - e.g. the 2nd paragraph talks about the laws in educational institutions but, then paragraph 3 describes the data and kinds of abuse, then paragraph 4 discusses central laws

Methods:

- This is the most important part of the manuscript and needs more clarity.
- e.g. "...The secondary data are obtained from the archive documents, observation notes, and procedural operations related to the object of the research and analyzed using Miles and Huberman's interactive model. This involved the Technical Implementation Unit of Integrated..." the second sentence gives an impression that the UPTDPPA is a source of secondary data but, the subsequent paragraphs describe it as a source of primary data.
- Also, it would be helpful to know what kind of secondary data the researcher had access to. How many people were interviewed, how many FGDs conducted are important information,
- IRBs do not give license to do research. They usually provide ethical approvals.
- It appears that the researcher has spoken with agencies - here identifying the person that they interviewed/ conducted FGDs with is important.

Results: It is poorly organized with references inserted - which is not required.

- the second paragraph is irrelevant in the results section.
- the 3rd paragraph has conclusions and recommendations.

- Figure 2 does not seem to add to the discussion.

Conclusions: The conclusions seem to be repeating the results and do not seem to build from the results.