Response to Reviewer 1 Decision (3-01-2024)

REVIEWER 1	RESPONSE
The present manuscript, titled "Adolescent Experiences of Sex Education: A Qualitative Study," seeks to describe and understand the experiences of 12 adolescents with sex education. I appreciate the insights provided by the current study into this important topic as there is still a dearth of research on sexuality education among adolescents. I enjoyed reading this manuscript, and believe it will be of interest to the readership of *Children*. However, I have some suggestions for the authors to remove the manuscript, noted below:	The authors are grateful for the reviewer's comments. We have provided responses to all the suggestions below.
1. First, considering the study's focus on the perspectives of only twelve participants, I might advise the authors to revise the title to avoid any unintended implications of a broader, national evaluation. One example along these lines might be something like "Insights from a Qualitative Exploration of Adolescents 'Opinions on Sex Education" – a minor adjustment, but one that I believe could enhance the clarity of your paper's focus and help readers accurately interpret the scope of your research. .	We thank the reviewer for his consideration and have changed the title of the article to the suggested example.

2. Page 2: "Gravningen et al [13] noted that many adolescents had their first sexual experience online" – what does this mean? An extra sentence here may be helpful to provide context.	The authors are grateful for the reviewer's comments. In response to the reviewer's requests, the phrase has been elaborated to improve and broaden the meaning. "Gravningen et al [13] observed that many adolescents had their first real-world sexual experience after meeting someone online; they used the internet to meet potential sexual partners."
3.Along similar lines, I think the paragraph about online sexual experiences and learning is a good setup for your study finding about participants turning to the Internet to fill the gaps in sexuality education left by school curricula, but I think a better case can be built in this paragraph for why adolescents might do this. There is a body of literature suggesting the effectiveness of online approaches in improving sexual knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors among adolescents. The Internet also provides a space for adolescents to receive sensitive/taboo information in a comfortable and private way, avoiding potentially awkward conversations with friends or family members. If not in the Introduction, then perhaps this would be suitable in the Discussion.	The authors are grateful for the reviewer's comments. A sentence on the benefits of internet use has been added to the Discussion.
4. It is not until the Methods that we receive any indication that this research took place in Spain. Would it be possible to set up in the Introduction why this research is important to be conducted there specifically, or details on the state of sex education in Spain compared to other places in the world?	In response to the reviewer's request, a sentence on the state of sex education in Spain has been added to the Introduction.

5. Also, in the Introduction it might be helpful to distinguish any established differences between private and public school sex education, considering that all of these participants experienced private school sex education. I would also include in the Abstract that the sample came from a private school as that is a unique characteristic of the sample that may limit generalizability.	We agree with the reviewer's comment. In the Abstract we have added that the participants study at a private school. In the Introduction we cite several studies on the difference between private and state schools in terms of the sex education provided.
6. Please provide information about how you got from all 4th year of ESO students being invited to participate (how many is this) to only 12 participants being included in the final sample. How many were excluded due to lack of parental consent vs their own decision not to participate? Did the researchers consider a waiver of parental consent or believe that this may have helped with recruitment?	We agree with the reviewer's comments. Further information on the final sample of participants can be found in the Participants and context section.
7. In Table 1, one of the "male" gender labels says "hombre" – unsure if this was intentional or a mistake.	We have corrected the typo in table 1.
8. In Table 1, what does the "Sexual identity/gender" label mean? I am assuming it is just their gender identity; if so, please reword.	We agree with the reviewer's comments. The label in table 1 has been changed.

9. In-depth interviews are labeled “I” in the table and “IDI” in text. I would suggest being consistent with one term (I recommend “IDI”) to avoid any confusion.	We agree with the reviewer's comment. We have changed the term “I” to “IDI”.
10. Some of these findings are very rich and prompt further discussion and implications. I would advise that the authors provide more interpretation and recommendations for future research and intervention in the Discussion section. For example, in Results section 3.1.2, you discuss the teachers not being trained or comfortable in the material that they are teaching. What would you recommend, based on this finding? For example, future research could explore the development and effectiveness of specialized teacher training programs focused on enhancing educators' comfort and competency in addressing sensitive sexuality-related topics. In terms of policy recommendations, perhaps there could be incentive programs for teachers participating in professional development or continuing education related to sex education. These are just some ideas, but I feel as though much more could be said in the Discussion section to expand on the specifics of your findings, if the world limit allows.	We agree with the reviewer's comment. A section on recommendations for future research has been added to the end of the Discussion.

11.A big critique is the lack of Limitations. I strongly suggest including more limitations in addition to the one sentence you have about the limited generalizability of the sample. Was there a risk of social desirability bias? What about the potential bias in participant selection, with certain participants excluded based on the methods getting to the 12 participants?	We agree with the reviewer's comment. New study limitations have been included.