



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Cancer and Tumor International</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JCTI_38345
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutritional Status of Lung Cancer Patients in Benghazi City of Libya
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 (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>1. There are some spelling errors: NO NEED for CAPITAL LETTER “ there are only Two public hospitals”, “Most of the Subjects (66 %) had not”</p> <p>2. You wrote in “Results”: “Rating showed that while 22.3 % were severely malnourished another 70.2 % were either at risk of malnourishment or suspected to be malnourishments. Only 7.4% were well nourished” but you wrote in “Abstract”- „ Only7.5 % of the subjects were well nourished. 22% of were severely malnourished; while 70.5 % were either at risk of malnutrition”. Please, remember that the figures MUST BE THE SAME</p> <p>3. You wrote in “Results”: “A majority of the subjects were married (95 %)” but in the table there is: “married – 95 (78.5%)”</p> <p>4. Why you did not write the percentage in Table 4 in all the lines?</p> <p>5. The sentences: “The present study carried out to assess the nutritional status of the lung cancer patients in Benghazi city, 22.3 % were severely malnourished another 70.2 % were either at risk of malnourishment or suspected to be malnourishments. Only 7.4 % of the subjects were well nourished” should be deleted from „Conclusions”</p> <p>6. REFERENCES: - paper 3 - Int J Cancer. 2015;136(5):E359-86 - add the pages - paper 4 - The lancet oncology. 2013; 31;14(9):813-22 – delete „13” - paper 5 - International journal of epidemiology. 2015;16;45(3):929-39 – it is “2016” - paper 11 - Eur J Clin Nutr. 2002;56(8):779-85 – add the pages - paper 12 - Eur J Clin Nutr. 2003;57(2):305-9 – add the pages - paper 36 - British journal of cancer. 2014; 111(3):608-18 – add the pages</p> <p>7. I would advise to add the reference paper: <i>Polanski J, Jankowska-Polanska B, Uchmanowicz I, Chabowski M, Janczak D, Mazur G, Rosinczuk J. Malnutrition and Quality of Life in Patients with Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer. Adv Exp Med Biol 2017;1021:15-26</i> The authors revealed that “up to 51.1% of patients were undernourished, 23.9% were at risk of malnutrition, and only 25.0% showed a normal nutrition”</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mariusz Chabowski
Department, University & Country	Dept of Clinical Nursing, Wroclaw Medical University, Poland