



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This article is interesting, but it can be accepted under modifications. 1. Introduction - The introduction is very long. So many points should be removed and be forwarded to the discussion - The range of risk of cervical cancer is not only base between 15-49 years 2. Materials and methods - The description of the study area is too vast. Many points of that description are not so important: the distance from the town to the hospital, the number of professionals workers, ... - The period of time used for the study should be précised 3. Result and discussion - Results and discussion should be divided in two sections: 3.1 Results 3.2 Discussion - not all the elements in the table must be commented, because they have been already mentioned in the table - Your discussion is localized only in Nigeria. Try to compare your results with Africans and/or the world researchers. 5. References The references are not written following the author guidelines.	1. The introduction was abridged as recommended and irrelevant information removed. - The range of reproductive age is 15-49 years and not risk for cervical cancer. This was corrected 2. The description of the study area was summarised as recommended and irrelevant information removed. The period of time used for the study was stated. 3. Results and discussion were divided into two sections as suggested. - Presentation of results was summarize not to include all element mentioned in the table. - Discussion was compared with others Africans and world researchers References are written following author guidelines as suggested.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		