



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

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript seems not to address the reasons for late presentation as stated in the objectives. What are the variables collected in the data sheet? Who collected them? What measure were put in place to ensure uniformity? The statistical presentation is too complicated and difficult to understand or follow. There are too many tables not addressing the objective of identifying factors causing late presentation. There is no comparison of the findings with previous works in African setting where late presentation is common. Please clarify the ethical issue: Was permission of patients to use their photographs sought?</p>	<p>Information further clarified and missing detail added see Methods and materials</p> <p>The authors have a clear research question and aim to provide current data particularly for Zimbabwe and collectively on developing countries data updates using a prospective cross sectional approach and the statistical analysis is called discriminant analysis, meant to separate patient delays by possible predictive characteristics and therefore determining the alarming predictors. With this clarity the authors consider this paper proper for publication as an original research paper Yes consent was given See Ethics Statement i.e Consent to participate to in the study and to publish the inserted pictures were sought from the patients in both written and verbal form.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Why were the patients who refuse treatment excluded from the study?</p>	<p>Not the intended meaningcorrected to "Patients who did not have final histology " see exclusion criteria</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>The introduction is not discussing the problem of late presentation and it's possible causes.</p>	<p>Corrected.....see introduction</p>