



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Cancer and Tumor International</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JCTI_29757
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors Contributing to Delayed Breast Cancer presentation: A prospective study at Parirenyatwa Group of Hospitals, Harare, Zimbabwe 2010-2013.
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

ART 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	<p>This paper has value as it comes from a Zimbabwe and little data is published from there.</p> <p>However, it is long winded with poor punctuation and grammatical errors that need to be reviewed. It needs a major rewrite.</p> <p>It is difficult determine if the authors are using clinical stage at presentation or </>3 months to define delay.</p> <p>It is mentioned that most patients present with advanced disease- but what percentage.</p> <p>In the abstract: (lines 22-25) the conclusion mentions reducing early pregnancy. This has no relevance in the context in which it is written.</p> <p>In the introduction there is poor punctuation and hence is nonsensical. This could be abbreviated to incorporate fewer numbers that are relevant to the paper and condensed to half the size</p> <p>Line 47, "other studies", is not referenced.</p> <p>Line 57-58 – what is the meaning that the author wants to get across?</p> <p>The study design, sampling procedure, ethics statement, statistical analysis and inclusion/exclusion criteria can be placed under methods.</p> <p>The sample size estimation is confusing and of questionable value as it includes different variables than those which are being reviewed. It includes stage 3 and 4 disease when the question being addressed is delays. It is also not referenced.</p> <p>It would be better to describe delay in the terms of stage at presentation as well as the time to</p>	<p>The authors have made efforts to rewrite and review grammatical errors, however the comment is vague and not specific it would be effective and precisely better had it been line referenced using the given numbering.</p> <p>Clarified see methods, and abstract</p> <p>Given and clarified see line 168-169.</p> <p>Corrected, statement paraphrased and relevance clarified.</p> <p>The authors made efforts to fairly correct mentioned errors. However, the reviewer is not specific. Note introduction describe the background situation using the funnel approach which the reviewer lacks appreciation. The authors considered to acquaint the readers with a brief quantified and qualified background of breast cancer burdens among other cancers in from Global to Zimbabwe context.</p> <p>Corrected as suggested.</p> <p>The reference and all Information is given clearly, i.e "p = Proportion of breast cancer patients in stage III & IV, p = 94%, calculated from a proportion of breast cancer patients delayed for more than three months in a study done by Muguti <i>et al.</i>, (1993) in Zimbabwe" we assume the reviewer lack sample size and power appreciation.</p> <p>Corrected. See results section.</p> <p>Corrected.</p> <p>Corrected to reasons of delayed breast cancer also</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>presentation.</p> <p>The wording and grammar in the results section is poor and needs a rewrite.</p> <p>Line 171- the statistics do not add up to 100%.</p> <p>Line 166-167 are repeated in 174-175.</p> <p>Under heading “presentation delay alarming predictors”: the wording is confusing and should be written to say what is meant - ? HIV+ patients were more likely to have delays to diagnosis.</p> <p>Line 187-188 makes an incorrect assumption- ie lack of education means ignorance.</p> <p>Figure 4 and table 3 are unnecessary as written in the text.</p> <p>Tables 5 and 6 are difficult to read.</p> <p>Grammar and punctuation in the discussion needs to be addressed.</p> <p>In the conclusion- line 239 needs to be referenced and include the word “delay”.</p>	<p>been responded as requested by other reviewer.</p> <p>Corrected, has been rephrased.</p> <p>The authors consider it necessary to display results in the same form not only in text.</p> <p>Other readers may want to check model assumptions and validity, therefore its necessary.</p> <p>Addressed, however the reviewer should have been specific.</p> <p>Paraphrased and referenced.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		