

**Protecting children from online sexual abuse in Bangladesh: A policy brief**Towhid MII et al. ([atiqulm26@bsmmu.edu.bd](mailto:atiqulm26@bsmmu.edu.bd))

<b>Reviewer's information</b>			
Date review assigned	8-Jun-23	Date review returned	12-Jun-23
Reviewer name	Md. Mahabub Ul Alam Khan	Affiliation	In House Lawyer, The Lawyers & Jurists
Email	khanemon810@gmail.com	ORCID	0000-0001-8763-9867
Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s?	No	Do you wish to be disclosed to the author?	Yes

<b>Reviewer's comments (12-Jun-23)</b> [Please select "Yes" or "No"]		<b>Author's response (14-Jun-23)</b> [Please write a response if the reviewer's comment is "No". You must change the manuscript as per your response. Mention line numbers.]	
1. Is the title appropriate?	No	We believe our given title matches the content of the paper. We have revised the running head.	
2. Is the research question or study objective clearly defined in measurable terms?	Yes	-	
3. Is the abstract accurate, balanced and complete?	No	We have revised the abstract.	
4. Is the study design appropriate to answer the research question or achieve objective?	Yes	-	
5. Are the Methods described sufficiently to allow others to repeat it?	Yes	-	
6. Are the operational definitions and ascertainment of key variables given adequately?	No	We have added the definition of children.	
7. Are the outcomes clearly defined?	Yes	-	
8. Are statistics used appropriately and described fully?	No	We did not work with primary data. So, no data were analyzed.	
9. Do the Results address the research question or objective clearly?	No	We have made necessary revisions.	
10. Are the tables and figures clear and appropriate to address the objective or research question?	Yes	-	
11. Does the Discussion cover the main points of the paper?	No	We have edited as much as possible to reflect the objective of the study.	
12. Are the strengths and limitations addressed?	No	This paper being a policy brief, we did not add any strengths and limitations.	
13. Are the conclusions justified by the results	No	We have revised the conclusion and tried to justify the results.	
14. Are the references up-to-date, and appropriate?	Yes	-	
15. Is the standard of written English acceptable for publication?	Yes	-	
16. <b>Descriptive comments</b> to the authors (Divide it into MAJOR and MINOR points).		Respond and reflect it in your manuscript. If you refute, justify your argument using references. Mention line numbers.	
MAJOR points: 1. Please highlight the actual scenario in the abstract & put an appropriate solution for such problems. The sentences you have used are not clearly indicating your point of view in real sense.  2. The limitation are not clearly mentioned in this article which should be done accordingly to make it worth to the audiences.		1. We have revised the abstract section.  2. This being a policy review, we did not include any limitation.	

MINOR points:		
1. Please correct the grammatical mistakes and make the sentences complete		1. We have revised the manuscript and addressed grammatical mistakes along with incomplete sentences
<b>17. Reviewer's Recommendation</b>	Major revision	

<b>Editor's comments</b> (12 Jan 2023)		<b>Author's response</b> (14 Jan 2023) Please respond to all comments from the editor and reviewer(s). Indicate the line number(s) of the manuscript where the changes are done.
1. This will be a helpful policy brief for preventing online sexual abuse of children. However, the document could be shorter without losing any information. Its word count must come down to 3000 or less.		We have revised the manuscript and kept the word count of the main text within 3000.
<b>Editor's Decision</b>	<b>Major revision</b>	