



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Cancer and Tumor International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JCTI_23512
Title of the Manuscript:	INCIDENCE OF CERVICAL CANCER IN CALABAR, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original Research Articles

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	I really enjoyed reading this manuscript. I appreciate the great summary of existing works from Nigeria about cervical cancer data. I would suggest several additions to this nice paper: 1- For international readers, could you please add a paragraph in the beginning of the introduction about Nigeria? You talk a lot about data from different parts of Nigeria. Could you please summarize how Nigeria is divided up? 2.Is the healthcare system different in different regions? Are the demographics of the population different in different regions and could that play a role in the varying incidence of cervical cancer. 3. Could you please explain how the tumour registry in Calabar works? Where does it get its information from (for instance how many hospitals in the region send info to the registry? How many hospitals are there total in the region and how many may not send info to the registry?). Who works for the tumour registry? How is data recorded and stored? There are great fluctuations in the incidence of cervical cancer by year. This seems quite odd from a medical and biological point of view. Could there be another explanation? Such as: what was going on politically	1.Agreed.A paragraph describing different parts of Nigeria has been added 2.Agreed: Regional differences in health care have been highlighted and the perceived reasons for the differences have been stated. 3. Agreed; The operations of the tumour registry have been explained . Attempt has been made to explain the wide yearly variation in data in the discussion.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	and fiscally during the years of lowest reporting? Is it possible that information was just not being captured? Perhaps the tumour registry was not functioning well during those years? Alternatively, maybe during those years, women were not coming in for treatment because of political or fiscal turmoil.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. In the abstract- line 17, what exactly do the 3 age specific incidences pertain to? (years? Age groups? – please specify) 2. line 52 what does South East pertain to in terms of the hospitals or region? 3, line 88 typo should be country-wide (with a hyphen) 4. line 98 residents (plural) 5. lines 109-110 – how are you dividing up the years to summarize your data? By 2 year intervals? By 5 year intervals? 6. line 148: what is the incidence of HIV in Nigeria? Does it vary by region? 7. line 172: how does cervical cancer get diagnosed? Only when symptomatic? Is there any screening in Nigeria? Who pays for it? 8. I am just pointing out a few typos but there are many in the paper – please go back and carefully read through and correct.	1 Agreed: The Crude incidence and Adjusted rate pertain to years while Age specific incidence Rate pertain to age groups. 2 Agreed: South East pertains to geopolitical zone and this is explained in the text. 3 Agreed: Corrected. 4 Agreed : Corrected 5 Agreed: The age groupings are at 5 years interval and this now explained in the text. 6 Agreed: The HIV national prevalence has been added to the text. 7 Agreed; The diagnosis follows symptomatic presentation and there is no national screening programme. This is highlighted in the text. 8 Agreed. Many of the Typos have been spotted and corrected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The font and spacing of this manuscript is incredibly irritating. The spacing between words is random. I would suggest using a font such as New Times roman 12 point and only one space between each word.	Agreed: Font and spacing are adjusted to the type specified by the Submissions editor. Thanks for your kind review.