



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>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>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>presentation. The wording and grammar in the results section is poor and needs a rewrite. Line 171- the statistics do not add up to 100%. Line 166-167 are repeated in 174-175. 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. Line 187-188 makes an incorrect assumption- ie lack of education means ignorance. Figure 4 and table 3 are unnecessary as written in the text. Tables 5 and 6 are difficult to read. Grammar and punctuation in the discussion needs to be addressed. In the conclusion- line 239 needs to be referenced and include the word “delay”.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Sharon Čačala</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Department of Surgery, University of KwaZulu Natal, South Africa</p>