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Reviewer's report:

General impression:
Thank you for addressing the previous comments and the other reviewer's comment so comprehensively. The paper now reads much better and I believe it has significant contribution towards improving sexual and reproductive health knowledge and information among adolescents in the country at large. I however, have minor comments and edits that I would like to suggest to the authors.

Abstract
This is good and has improved nicely from the previous version. I'd add a recommendation on how the modes and platforms of service delivery can be improved to ensure that ASRH information is also delivered/ prioritized… that is, what is needed to improve adolescents' SRH knowledge and information, especially those experiencing/experienced pregnancy in line with Safe Motherhood objectives.

Introduction
this section is now well-written, well done!
Line 137 pg 5: check spelling for provinces

Methods
Line 147 pg 6: I think the other reviewer here wanted something like "adolescent girls with obvious cognitive abilities, such as being diagnosed with (or with known) mental health problems were excluded from the study"… something specific on your exclusion criteria… as you have described it in line 162.

General comment: please be consistent- often times you use just adolescents, then use adolescent females… I'd use adolescent girls throughout. This manuscript has way too many tables! Some of the tables can really be summarized in a 1 or 2 paragraphs, and others be combined (e.g. table 6+7 can be one table- its STIs and HIV). Table 8+9 can be summed into a paragraph or 2.
In your tables, please distinguish the ledger/ footnote info from the table contents, e.g. line 50-53 pg35 and table 12 line 30-32 pg 38 with a different font or something similar, outside the "actual" table…

Discussion
I would start with a sentence about the main objective of this study, then proceed as per the 1st paragraph. I would delete the 2nd paragraph- you have already provided info on the LO program, no need to redescribe it in the discussion.
Line 459-461 is not clear and probably contradicts the 1st sentence of the same paragraph…

Limitations: thanks for adding this part, though it does not necessarily need a subheading of its own- it typically forms part of the discussion section (unless you're writing a thesis). It is important to place an emphasis on the significance of your study despite the limitations… at the moment, you have just listed them without drawing on the importance of your study, under these limitations…?

Conclusion
This section is way too long for a conclusion. From your findings, you should be able to put together 2/3 lines on key message of your findings, 2 lines of general recommendations, one line for future research… you must remember that most people, especially policy makers and most people really read the abstract and conclusion of a paper, so make sure to concise here.
Some of the paragraphs in this section can be well suited in the discussion section, e.g. the 1st paragraphs here can be moved to the beginning of the discussion section.
I'd recommend the authors to summarize this section into 1 paragraph.
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