

Review of: "The Parental Role in Child Sexuality: A Phenomenological Study"

Daniel C. Oshi¹

¹ University of the West Indies

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

General Remarks: In this current globalization era, when there are so much misinformation, disinformation and contestation of sexuality, especially, child sexuality, the authors undertook an investigation into a very pertinent, albeit, sometimes, sensitive issue, child sexuality. The investigation is, therefore, not only important but also timely.

Abstract:

This is very well written in an unstructured format. The organization, grammar and contents are well-delivered, with clear portrayal of the key findings, and conclusion/implications of the study.

Introduction and literature review:

This is well written and provides concise background to the reader for clearer understanding of the rest of the manuscript.

Main Thrust of Review:

I will focus the main thrust of my review comments on areas/ sections that need more serious attention and revision by the authors to contribute to guiding them in improving the manuscript.

Literature Sources Cited by the Authors:

All the cited materials are way older than 15 years, several of them are actually more than 20 years old. The most current materials they cited are 2006 materials. The authors should please update the manuscript with more current literature.

Methodological Considerations:

The authors stated that the design of this study is phenomenological design, and this informed their choice of a small sample size. The chosen design is appropriate for the nature of the research problem and for answering their research questions.

Nonetheless, the specific steps taken in the study had serious shortfalls for a phenomenological research design. Specifically, a phenomenological design is best designed to collect indepth, rich, detailed, contextualized data. Some authorities argue that multiple interviews (preferably three) should be conducted with the participants, but this is not the main concern here, though such an approach has been noted to contribute to improving the trustworthiness of study findings. The main concern here is whether or not the authors were able to collect indepth, rich, detailed, data using semi-

structured interviews, conducted only once per participants, rather than using indepth interviews. This is not very clear in the manuscript. A case in point is that they only showed “brief” direct quotations as tabulated categories.

Furthermore, some readers may want to get an idea of how long the interviews lasted. Was there data saturation? If yes, how was this achieved, given the single, one-off semi-structured interviews with the participants.

Section 7.6:

The authors delved deep into descriptive statistics and display (using tables and charts) of the sociodemographic characteristics of their sample (sample size was 9 participants). They made good attempts, but some of their actions may be deemed superfluous. I have made some suggestions below to guide their revision.

Suggestions:

1. Do not use both table and chart (graph) to display the same set of results.
2. With a sample size of nine (9), mean age of the participants (alongside its standard deviation) should be sufficient, in addition to showing the ages of the youngest and oldest participants (minimum and maximum ages).
3. Table 1 is not necessary. You may remove it.
4. Table 2 is not necessary. Please, remove it.
5. Graph 1 is also not necessary. Please, remove it.
6. In my opinion, ALL the tables in Section 7.6 should be deleted as they are not necessary.
7. Similarly, ALL the charts (graphs) in Section 7.6 should be deleted because they are not necessary.

* Your sample size is just nine (9) and so, it does not add much value to carry out extensive use of tables and charts to show the distributions of key sociodemographic characteristics of the participants.

8. You can use just ONE TABLE to show the distribution of key sociodemographic characteristics of the participants.
9. Please, note that taking percentages of some of the key sociodemographic characteristics of your participants may be misleading since your sample size is just 9. This is evidenced by what is shown on “Table 7. Distribution of the sample according to professional activity.” As shown in the table, several of the professional categories have just one participant, with a percentage of 11.1.

Section 8:

Comments:

1. The identified categories are appropriate and sufficiently relate to the research questions.
2. The authors seemed to use direct quotations ONLY as category of analysis shown in tables. This is not sufficient. It will

enrich their findings if they can include longer/larger direct quotations that provide more depth, perspective and context, and situate such quotations within the text, rather than merely in tables.

3. The authors made some attempts to bring in published literature in the interpretation of their findings. However, I would have liked to see a more critical interrogation of their findings vis-à-vis existing literature.

Conclusions:

These are relevant and are supported by the findings; generally a good attempt.