



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Cancer and Tumor International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JCTI_42732
Title of the Manuscript:	Chemoports, A surgical audit of three years in a comprehensive cancer care center
Type of the 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	Dear Editor: Thanks for invite me to review the manuscript, titled: Chemoports, A surgical audit of three years in comprehensive cancer care center. This manuscript is interesting, but have some errors that author need review. Specially in results.	
Minor REVISION comments	ABSTRACT Line 67: Please review the paragraph. Material and Methods: Line 74: Could the authors attach the ethical document or provide the approval number? Results Table 1 Please provide information about the other types of tumours in the text. I would use the AJCC/TNM classification and relate the clinical stage to the value and percentage. In the chemotherapy regimen, I recommend that the authors use a specific table and define each CT regimen and specify the regimen defined as 'others' in the foot of the table. Define the follow-up period in terms of days. In the median days that the catheter was used, please define the range of the days and the standard deviation (SD) in the same chart, e.g., 256, (range 11-763, SD), and eliminate the range. Discussion Line 171: Please define OR. Line 173, 174: Please explain, if possible, the logistic factors Line 178: The authors mention hematoma; please provide the percentage of patients with hematoma and the related problems in the results section. Line 251: Please explain why obtaining consent was not applicable. ethical issues: Yes, but authors need provide the number approbation or entire document	
Optional/General comments	No comments	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rogelio González-González
Department, University & Country	Universidad Juárez del Estado de Durango, Mexico