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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

N/A - there are no statistics in this study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Probably - with minor revisions
PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS:

This is a very interesting manuscript that covers a novel topic and shows important differences between etic and emic perspectives on sexual exploitation. The outline of these differences makes a contribution to the literature and will be useful to others attempting to create educational interventions. The authors appear to have addressed the comments of past reviewers well.

In general, what remains to be addressed largely relates to issues of copyediting and ensuring proper grammar, comma usage and clarity of writing.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Abstract

* I assume this is for an anthropology journal? If not, then emic perspective should be defined at first use and likely not used in the title

* I would avoid the use of AGYM as an acronym — it does not spell anything that can stand in for adolescent girls and young women meaningfully and therefore only adds to the cognitive load of the reader rather than reduce the cognitive load.

* Results section of abstract, AGYW is plural - so it should say were considered - the girls and women were considered vulnerable, were considered responsible. — this is another reason to avoid the use of the acronym as it is unclear when it is standing in for the singular vs. Plural (your definition is plural, but you then use it in the singular when you refer to "her situation" it also makes little sense to say "adolescent girl and young woman was considered responsible for her situation." - so even changing it to singular does not help to make the use appropriate.

* They in the last sentence of the abstract is unclear and unspecified. I think it refers to "interventions"

Note: this paper has been previously reviewed, but I am not one of the previous reviewers.

Background

* Page 6, line 11/12, which should be that

* Page 7, line 31/32, missing comma after "In Uganda"

* Page 7, bottom of page, you've already been using AGYW but now you define it and spell it out. It should only be spelled out at first use and from there on it should be the acronym, but
please refer to my earlier comment suggesting that you drop the acronym entirely to facilitate ease of reading.

* With the edits you've made, the last paragraph on page 7 appears to be a single sentence paragraph. Please incorporate this sentence into one of the other paragraphs.

* Page 8, second line, you can say aged 15-24, or you can cut the word aged and say 15-25 years of age (aged and years of age are redundant and thus both do not need to be included).

* Page 8, last sentence of first paragraph, oddly worded list with too many "ands" - try to word more concisely.

* Missing . After al in et al

* Page 9, comma between different reasons and is important is unnecessary

* Page 9, line 15, the last part of this sentence is unclear and should be re-written

* Avoid the use of contractions (e.g., don't vs. Do not)

* The previous reviewer seems to have suggested the use of a theoretical framework, and the response to the reviews mentions one insofar as describing the data analysis approach, however, a theoretical framework could still be added to the introduction itself as a formal guiding structure for the entire paper/study.

Methods

* Page 9, line 40, comma after dominates is not needed

* Page 9, line 45/46, no comma needed between whether and the social and structural

* The first paragraph on page 10 is very long (longer than a page, and should be broken into more than one paragraph

* Page 12, line 33, are should be is (as it's referring to the word content not to the word vignettes)

* Page 13, line 30, no comma needed between literature and and

* Page 13, line 47, try and should be try to

* I would place the ethical consideration section earlier in the method section as obtaining ethics for a study is the first step prior to conducting the study.
Results

* Page 17, line 34 - I would re-word the end to say "but was instead disapproved of for other reasons elaborated upon below.

* Wherever using "however" or "therefore" ensure proper comma usage as well (applies throughout the paper) http://www.cws.illinois.edu/workshop/writers/tips/commas/

Discussion

* Page 31, line 23, comma missing after definitions

* Page 33, commas missing around "raining by men and boys"

* Page 33, line 33, missing comma after ideology

* Include a heading before limitations section

Conclusion

* Divide into more than one paragraph

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

The key point that the previous reviewers brought up that I don't think was fully addressed in this revision was the suggestion of using a feminist theoretical framework to approach the topic. I understand that a social constructivist approach was used for data analysis, and that is appropriate, but a paper can also have an overall theoretical framework that helps to pull together perspectives from past literature and solidify the need for the study and then the overall discussion of the study's results.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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