

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_116134
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF THE KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDES OF STUDENTS OF SMAN 14 JAKARTA REGARDING THE HPV VACCINE AS PREVENTION OF CERVICAL CANCER
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalarjgo.com/index.php/ARJGO/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The issue studied by the authors of the manuscript is relevant to the international community because HPV is the most widespread sexually transmitted infection among adults, and certain types of this virus can increase the risk of developing cervical cancer or other genital or rectal cancers. While it is widely known that HPV vaccines can prevent as much as 70% of cervical cancer cases, some populations still harbor prejudice against this type of prevention. Therefore, studying the awareness of young people regarding this issue is crucial.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract's structure seems appropriate and meets standard requirements. However, it would be beneficial to include additional details in the conclusions section instead of simply providing the percentage of participants. The conclusions should effectively summarize the importance of the data gathered and determine whether the results are favorable for developing preventive measures or concerning. The authors present this information in the discussion and should include it clearly and concisely in the conclusions. Additionally, it would be helpful to know the prospects for future research. Furthermore, the abstract lacks a clear statement of the study's purpose. These suggestions are not limited to the abstract's conclusions but apply to the manuscript.</p> <p>4. The arrangement of subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are suitable and appropriate.</p> <p>I have a few comments for the authors. Could you please state the purpose of the study more clearly? Also, I would like to seek clarification on a phrase written in the Results subsection: 'This questionnaire was tested on 30 female high school student respondents who were not female at SMAN 14 Jakarta to test whether each question item was valid.' If the students were not female, were they male? I would suggest not using tables for Cronbach's Alpha. It is sufficient to indicate the coefficients in the text. Lastly, could you please specify your conclusions based on the points that I have mentioned above?</p> <p>5. I think the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references provided are both recent and sufficient.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript's text needs to undergo another round of proofreading to correct any errors in grammar and punctuation.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Olena Yelizarova
Department, University & Country	State Institution O.M. Marzieiev Institute for Public Health of the National Academy of Medical Sciences of Ukraine, Ukraine