Dear Editor:

We are pleased to resubmit for publication the revised version of “Religiosity and sexual abstinence among Nigerian youths: Does parent religion matter?” We appreciate the comments of the Editor and the reviewers and it has helped improve the manuscript greatly. We have addressed each of their concerns as outlined below:

Reviewer reports:

(Reviewer 2):

The manuscript is improved with attention to the earlier feedback. A number of concerns remain, particularly in relation to editing. Further review of the manuscript with clear and consistent presentation of the research focus and questions throughout all sections of the manuscript would be helpful. Examples of concerns are listed below:

Thank you for the following examples of the types of problems within the manuscript. We have addressed the specific examples and engaged an academic researcher from another university (U.S.-based) in reviewing the manuscript with attention to clear and consistent presentation of the research focus. Several statements that may be considered tangential were removed. The hypotheses have been numbered and edited for clarity. In addition, several changes were made to aid consistency in describing the concepts under study and their interrelationships. In
particular, vague references, like “such associations,” have been replaced with the specific concepts/terms being discussed.

P. 3 line 5 "for instance males there is a higher percentage of males"?

This has been corrected.

Inconsistent citations throughout the paper

This has been corrected.

Language such as "grim portrayal" and "it is reassuring to know" has somewhat of a casual, less professional presentation (other examples throughout the paper, including "should not be ignored" and "which is very important" on p. 13-14)

This has been corrected.

p. 3 line 30: clearer standards than who/what?

This has been changed to “high moral standards”.

p. 5 line 4: "one major limitations"

This has been corrected.

p. 5 line 5: what research is "these studies" referring to? The Shaw & El-Bassel review includes a number of studies that examined religiosity.

This has been reworded.

p. 5 line 16 "so this study is important" and "is still quite scanty" and "her" could be reworded

This has been reworded.

p. 6 line 1: "unmatched explosion": compared to where?

This has been updated and cited.

Capitalization, punctuation, sentence structure issues

The manuscript has been read for these issues by an external academic researcher and adjustments made.

p. 14 line 7 "...abstaining is very significant" suggest rewording as significance leads one to consider statistical significance
This has been reworded.

It would be helpful to describe the limitations of the study, in addition to strengths.

Limitation of the study has been described in the paragraph after knowledge contribution.

Differences by religious affiliation are not discussed in the discussion and conclusion section, it may be helpful to explain the findings here.

This has been included.

The hypotheses refer to "biological and cognitive factors at the individual level" but I don't see a return to this language in the findings and discussion. Is this referring to age?

This has been discussed