



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_24778
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutritional Factors Associated With Breast Cancer at Gaza Strip: A Hospital Based Study
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	• Please check and correct carefully the language used in the manuscript. • Who was responsible for designing of questionnaire? • Line 43-44; the number of patients included into study is too low to make general statements • Its hard to talk about statistical significance with just few patients representing some analysed factors (e.g. menopause age, infertility) • Dairy products intake (line 475) what type of yogurt and cheese the Authors mean? • There is no discussion or summary in the manuscript • In current version final conclusions are unacceptable, please re-write them into e.g. summary Ethical issues: yes – patients data were used for analysis. the approval of ethical committee placed into manuscript	Checked. Our supervisor and pilot study done. It's sample for student in master degree. This is what was happened. Means low fat / skimmed or not. Sometimes not required by reviewers. Done. Participants were signed a consent form.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	• Please add country name into title of the manuscript • Conclusion (line 29-32) must be re-written • Line 38: please add citation- source of information • Lines 46-58: please add other sources of data, also into Reference list. Ferlay et al. 2000 is	Added Done. Added Added



SDI Review Form 1.6

	quite old source, according to statistical data • Line 62 (...) woman in Palestine • Please check carefully the references list • The reviewer suggests to use abbreviation for breast cancer term, e.g. BC in the text • Why tables' numeration starts from 4.1? • Please re-write the tables legends, to make them more informative. They can no be analysed separately from the text in current version. • All Figures could be removed without detriment for the manuscript, its doubling data from tables	Checked Will be changed at the last step of finishing required modifications. Corrected. It provides data and this may be objected by other reviewers.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Lot of data was collected in this study, but scientific description could be better	Ok