



REVIEWER REPORT

Manuscript Title:	Challenges of Teachers in the Implementation of Comprehensive Sexuality Education in a Basic Education Institution
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

EDITOR

Comments and Recommendations

The submission targets a socially important topic and uses an appropriate qualitative approach, but it remains a localized phenomenological account without the conceptual advance expected. The main risks are insufficient safeguarding detail for a sensitive topic, potential social desirability bias, and interpretive overreach. The manuscript could be publishable in a specialist education/health education journal if reporting and analytic transparency are strengthened.

REVIEWER 1

Specific Comments and Recommendations

Clarify the specific "basic education" grade levels involved. The challenges of CSE differ vastly between Grade 4 and Grade 10; pooling these teachers obscures developmental context.

The term "reflexive thematic analysis" is used, but the researcher's specific positionality and prior relationship with the participants are not adequately detailed.

Provide the interview protocol as a supplementary file.

The distinction between "lack of training" and "lack of resources" is blurred in the results; please separate these constructs clearly.

Citations in the introduction regarding global CSE standards need to be updated to the most recent UNESCO or WHO technical guidance.

General Comments and Recommendations

The manuscript addresses a culturally sensitive topic regarding Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) in the Philippines. While the qualitative examination of teacher resistance and adaptation is topically relevant, the current submission suffers from significant methodological limitations typical of localized case studies. The sample size is small, and the analysis remains descriptive rather than generating a robust, transferrable conceptual framework. The study lacks the mechanistic insight into behavioral change or policy friction required for publication.



Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Accept the manuscript for publication.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The manuscript, in its current form, is not acceptable for publication and requires substantial revision.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

REVIEWER 2

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
<p>Provide the interview and focus group guides, including how sensitive prompts were phrased.</p> <p>Report interview and focus group durations, facilitation training, and whether facilitators were in supervisory roles.</p> <p>Clarify how field notes were used in analysis and whether they altered theme construction.</p> <p>Add a structured limitations paragraph on transferability from a single institution and cultural specificity.</p> <p>Provide a clearer definition of "fidelity" in this context and avoid implying measurement if none occurred.</p>

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
<p>Given the sensitivity of sexuality education, the manuscript must provide ethics board approval (or waiver) details, risk mitigation steps, and participant protection measures beyond generic confidentiality statements. It should also explain how the focus group was managed to reduce inadvertent disclosure and peer pressure. Context of the curriculum and policy environment is underspecified. The manuscript should specify what content constitutes "comprehensive sexuality education" in the setting, which grade levels are covered, and what institutional guidance exists. Without this, constraints and strategies are hard to interpret and compare across contexts.</p>



Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	The manuscript, in its current form, is not acceptable for publication and requires substantial revision.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

SECOND ROUND

<u>Decision</u>	<u>Editor</u>	<u>Reviewer 1</u>	<u>Reviewer 2</u>
Accept the manuscript for publication.	/	/	/
Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.			
The manuscript, in its current form, is not acceptable for publication and requires substantial revision.			
Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.			