

A. Title: The study theme is important. I am delight to review it because the thematic area is very useful for me.

1. The title " Awareness about early menarche and its associated problems" enables the readers to think about the assessment of the level of the awareness about early age menarche and what challenges follow it. But the study is extended to level of knowledge measurement. Aware and knowledge are both useful to know. So the title will be more attractive and reflective if modified. The author can see the abstract RESULT part. It presented the "awareness and Knowledge as important reports". This tells the readers the two as the core.

Eg. Awareness and knowledge about early menarche and its associate problems...."

B. Abstract

2. The study setting is not clear. There is unclear and confusing idea. **The first** is the expression said "1st year, 2nd year and 3rd year medical college students in a medical college in Chennai"

The second in the title Said "..... female medical students of a tertiary care hospital in Chennai, Tamil Nadu".

The first seems the participants are college students. If so it is clear. But the second context expresses that that study participants are medical students and at the same time are clients of the hospital. In case of the second context these can also be students who might had the problems.

Therefore, it is better to make a consistent context.

C. Introduction and methods

3. The introduction is well done. Some editorials needed. The last paragraph stated some justifications of the study. There are some inclusions stated. First is "management of the RISK factors..." I am not clear what purpose this ideas has. Because the study is about the problems occurring following the early menarche but not about the risks. As evidence breast cancer and cardiac ischemia were considered common on these girls later life. The second is the discussion about attitude of the participants towards {early Puberty" and associated factors}. Dear author, I am bothered if the readers can use this study with good understanding. Or the study fruit could be hidden by the "TITLE" because it cannot explain or indicate the content. Neither the content can be explained in a single "TOPIC".

NB. Early puberty is a wider context and early menarche is only a component. Please reconsider it. Even the EARLY PUBERTY ATTITUDE can be a self-standing study and would be beneficial.

4. Dear author, would you state the name the institution of IRB? Why there was not a written consent?
5. The participants were included by convenient method. How was the proportion b/n the students' level of the college stay kept reasonable? Because you might need to check if the stay can contribute to the awareness and knowledge and even attitude? It is showed distribution is 72, 65 and 92 from 1st year, 2nd and 3rd year students. Please explain how it was done. You used as an important finding.

6. The way this study measured the knowledge is not stated. A study has to have and clearly explain in a manner that it can be replicated. Please write clearly the tool for the knowledge measurement. The same for the measurement of the awareness. Then how the analysis was done for the knowledge. This a KEY for the study of this type.
7. The conclusion part ended by recommending awareness programs and concluded by saying " In this way, we can prevent adolescent girls from early menarche and its associated problems". I consider this statement is **harmful**. Early menarche is caused not by the child. There are much more to say about to recommend. But, truly it is not prevented easily by awareness. The other important things 1) what type of awareness, 2) what level , 3) On whom 4) Media

D. Discussion and conclusions

The first paragraph of the discussion is not appropriate. It is like introduction and justification. Please remove it. If you want keep it but give references.

This study measures awareness and knowledge, so, focus on the finding and make wise evidenced recommendations is my constructive advice.

Finally I suggest this article needs major corrections. The methods and the results needs to be amended as recommended.