



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Cancer and Tumor International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JCTI_43965
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge of Cervical Cancer and its Risk Factors, Attitudes and Practices towards Pap Smear Screening among Students in the University of Buea, Cameroon
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>)

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	You may need to mention the role of proper contraceptive use, especially barrier methods, among sexually active female students. The rationale of the study is wobbling. The authors need to be spelt out what is known on the subject and highlight any gaps their study would fill. Their study does not provide any additional information the body of evidence. Their study design is wrongly written. A cross-sectional design is just okay. The abstract need to re-written. There are major punctuation issues and structural lacunae in the English construction of this article.	The use of barrier contraceptives among participants was not assessed. However, knowledge on non-use of contraceptive being a risk factor for HPV transmission was evaluated. This study was intended to assess the knowledge of male students which is not often reported, and to compare the knowledge of male students to that of female students. What is known on the subject and the gap our study contributes filling is stated in the introduction of the manuscript. (LINES 57-62). The design of the study has modified and written as cross-sectional. The abstract has been re-written. Grammatical errors corrected as well.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The scientific soundness and robustness of this article is not in doubt, however, in the light of currently available information on the subject the authors need to be more creative.	Dear reviewer, Thank you for appreciating the scientific soundness and robustness of the article. Though not creative in the light of currently available information, any contribution which will enhance the uptake of cervical cancer screening can only be salutary especially in our milieu where cervical cancer is the first



SDI Review Form 1.6

		cause of female genital cancer mortality; We acknowledge your critical appraisal of the manuscript and inputs! Kind regards.
--	--	--

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	