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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory revisions:
1. Methods: To be re-written to improve the quality of the article with following:
   a. Readers need to be explained how they have chosen the colleges. Is it randomly?
   b. Further, I am little confused whether the study was done in school/s or colleges or both as the authors described in methods, in Page 4, Lines 23-24, the authors have described that 'Classes of chosen subjects in each school were selected based on convenience sampling for the participating school.'
   c. Readers need to be explained on the details of the sample size calculation of 400. Was any software used? Was prevalence of any disease or risk factor used on this issue?
   d. As per statements made in this article that, from 2007 in the state of Maharashtra the sex education was discontinued. So how the problem was solved and the authorities of colleges have permitted and co-operated in data collection has to be explained.
2. I am yet to find a section ‘Discussion’

Major essential revisions:
1. The manuscript needs corrections of grammatical mistakes and framing of sentences.
2. Introduction: It could have been better if the authors re-write the part with the incorporation of the following problems of sex education also.
   a. Unfortunately in the conventional literature, the concept of sex education has been unintentionally clubbed with STI and HIV/AIDS.
   b. Along with the need of school based sex education programmes, the related problems of mass education regarding spreading concept family welfare prevention of adolescent marriage, adolescent pregnancy and nonexistence and/or reinforcements of sex education for adults in India.
   c. On the top of everything, in a male dominated society the sex education has rarely been targeted towards adolescent males.
3. ‘Results’ need to be trimmed with important positive and negative findings only.
4. Table 1: Please mention that multiple responses were noted for single participant.

5. Why ‘Conclusions’ was done twice?

6. Mentioning of the ‘Strength of the study’ and ‘Future directions of the study’ could improve the study

Discretionary revisions;

1. Any form of feedback (even informal) from the participating students on this type of research would have been beneficial for future times.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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