

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_92494
Title of the Manuscript:	Couples' Sexual Communication. Results from a Questionnaire and Conclusions for School-Based Sex Education
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.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The author should ensure that the Abstract captures critical details in the article so that when one reads it can appreciate it from a bird's eye view. 2. The Introduction should start from a global perspective, cascading to regional then show the national or current perspective, at the same time, justifying the gap the study sought to fill. 3. The objectives should be clearly spelt out so that they address what the study sought to do. 4. The Methodology section was inadequately done. Each method should be clearly explained justifying the choice of those methods. On quantitative methods, how did the author come up with the sample, the study area. These issues should be clear. 5. Findings of the study should start from a quantitative point of view and qualitative findings will be used to substantiate those findings so that the reader is not left wondering, Writing is an art, ensure that the readers' mind are captured. 6. Discussion should not repeat the findings, rather provide explanations for the findings and answer the so what questions. 7. There is need for a conclusion. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Article sounded more like a novel. 2. The author used personalising words. 3. The research findings are interesting, the author should repackage the article so that it is more formal and fit the academic portfolio 	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Andrea Toweka
Department, University & Country	Centre for Population Studies, University of Zimbabwe, Zimbabwe