



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Cancer and Tumor International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JCTI_27118
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge and Screening Practices of Cervical Cancer among Pregnant Women Attending Antenatal Clinic in Tertiary Hospitals in Enugu, South-Eastern Nigeria
Type of the Article	Short 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. Introduction: (i) It is imperative for the authors to state what is being done currently at the national or international level to reduce the burden of cervical cancer. Are there policy guidelines in place? If yes, what is the level of implementation and how effective are those policies? (ii) What is the current state of cervical cancer screening service provision in the study sites/communities in terms of cost and accessibility? 2. Methodology: (i) the description of study design appear too lengthy. It suffices to state that "the study made use of descriptive cross-sectional design". (ii) Considering the number of clients attending ANC in both study sites, a more scientific sampling method should have been used rather than "purposive" sampling technique used in this study. (iii) Sample size calculation: authors should state the total population used for their estimation. Was there provision for non-response? Does the constant used in the formula also mean study precision? (iii) Inclusion and exclusion criteria should be better articulated. (iv) Study instrument: authors should state whether it was interviewer or self	1.This was reflected in the introduction of the manuscript by the author 2. The description of the study was summarized and irrelevant information removed (ii) All the tertiary hospitals in Enugu were utilized for the study (iii) Sample size calculation: Total size used for the calculation was stated (iii) Inclusion and exclusion criteria are well stated and highlighted in yellow (iv) The questionnaire was interviewer administered and was translated into major dialect Igbo



SDI Review Form 1.6

	administered questionnaire Was there a need for translation of the instrument to local languages for those who don't understand English language? (v) Definition of key variables should be provided e.g what constitutes 'good knowledge' and how was it assessed? (vi) The main outcome variable should also be appropriately defined and characterized (vii) The ideal age for uptake and recommended interval of time for cervical cancer screening should be clearly stated with appropriate references. 3. Results: (i) Statements must be in reported speech i.e past tense rather than present tense should be used. (ii) Authors should try to report only significant findings in the foot notes rather than repeating all the contents of each table. (iii) All tables must be serially numbered (iv) Table 4 should have either column or row total (v) Tables 5 and 6 should be merged (vi) Other factors that may influence screening for cervical cancer should be considered at the level of bi-variate analysis 4. Discussion: Authors should be referenced and not numbers i.e the expressions such as compared to [3] rather than real authors were used throughout the discussion. This should be avoided 5. Conclusion: Appears to be too narrow in scope and needs to be expanded. The art and science of health education is multi-disciplinary and should not be restricted to	(V) Definition of key variables was highlighted. (vi) The ideal age for uptake and recommended interval of time for cervical cancer is clearly stated and highlighted in yellow colour 3. (i) Statements were edited and changed to past tense rather than present tense. (ii) Only significant findings were reported in the footnote (iii) tables are numbered serially as suggested (iv) Column is added to table 4 (v) Table 5 and 6 are merged together as suggested 4. Authors were referenced and not numbers. 5. The conclusion was broaden in scope and expanded to cut across a team of health care providers
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	particular cadre of healthcare workers.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The grammatical construction of most of the sentences in the result section needs to be improved upon. 1. Line 201; the word “to” should be removed 2. Lines 204-205; the statement needs re-phrasing 3. Line 206; “the findings” could be replaced with “our findings” 4. Line 207; authors should not start a sentence with numbers	The grammatical construction of the sentences in the result section were edited and improved upon. 1. Line 201 to was removed 2. Line 204-205 statement was rephrased 3. Line 206 “the finding was replaced with our findings” 4. Line 207 was corrected as suggested
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		