



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_61539
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge and Practice of breast cancer screening among women in South-Eastern Nigeria: A cross-sectional study
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/journal/10/editorial-policy> )



[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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p><b>Introduction:</b> The reading flows providing a pleasurable experience. Although, more context is needed in order to provide a better understanding about the problem in study.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please detail the screening methods for breast cancer and the recommendations according age range of women.</li> <li>• <b>The author(s) explained the problem especially why it is important to study rural populations:</b> "While the vulnerability of women to cancer in Nigeria has been established, studies investigating the participation of rural women in cancer screening are <b>few</b>, thus creating a gap in knowledge." They indicated the existence of few studies with rural women, so it would enrich the manuscript if these studies were added in the introduction, making clearer what is known and unknown in this specific population.</li> <li>• It is important to add justification for selecting only pregnant women to participate in this study. Besides, please add information about the motivation for choosing a public ranging from 15 years to 45 years to work with this subject, once screening for breast cancer policy targets women at age 40, at the earliest.</li> </ul> <p><b>Methods:</b></p> <p>The manuscript provides context about the location of the study, but more information is needed to make it possible to another researcher to replicate the study.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please, describe the health system in Ibeku to enhance the understanding about the access of Ibeku residents to health education about breast cancer, and make clear the availability of breast cancer screening strategies to women.</li> <li>• More information about the selection of houses and women is needed: How was the selection of households? Did is used randomization to select houses and women to participate in the study? How was the definition of number of women interviewed per household?</li> <li>• Please, show the calculation of the sample.</li> <li>• Describe the criteria for inclusion and exclusion of women.</li> <li>• More information is needed about how the questionnaire was structured in order to clarify potential misinterpretations.</li> <li>• Please describe more about the research instrument validation. How many people were interviewed in this phase? Did occur any change in the questionnaire after the validation?</li> <li>• Please provide details about how the questionnaire was applied, for example, when the questionnaire was applied? was it applied in only one moment? Where did the interview occur? How were the women approached to participate in the study?</li> </ul> <p><b>Results:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The subdivisions are well established.</b></li> </ul>	



In the section “**Practice of screening for breast cancer**” it is read:

“Table 4 shows that the majority (79.5%) of the women indicated that they had not been screened for breast cancer while only 5.0% indicated they had been screened. Out of the very low percentage that had been screened, most (92.3%) underwent breast self-examination while 7.8% underwent clinical breast cancer examination.”

- **However, Table 4 shows 92.3% out of 258 women interviewed, so all women were asked this question even those who answered that had not been screened.**

It is found: “Furthermore, the majority (79.5%) of the women got screened more than once.”

- **Is it possible to know by which method these women underwent? In the questionnaire it would be better to ask separately about each method periodicity.**

#### **Discussion**

- Please, provide explanation about why the women interviewed are considered as having adequate knowledge about breast cancer.
- Please, add the limitations of the study in the discussion section.
- It is important to discuss more your results with other similar studies, for example, comparing the percentual of women who undergo to CBE in these studies with your findings.
- Explore more the discussion of your results. Comparing what you found with what was expected to find for women in these age groups included in the study.

#### **Conclusion**

It is found a recommendation in this section: “sensitization campaigns on breast screening be intensified in rural areas as to improve their uptake of breast screening.” Besides sensitization it is important to have the screening methods available, in this line, please explore if the local government grant for women the participation in breast health awareness education, CBE and mammography.

#### **References**

- Seven papers cited were published in the last five years, but most papers were published around 8 to 13 years ago.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p><b>Abstract:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction: (...). The study is designed to determine the knowledge and practice of breast screening among women in <b>owerri</b>, South-Eastern Nigeria. <b>Owerri is not cited in Materials and Methods in the description of the study's location.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Introduction:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>There is more up to date reference that may be used about incidence and mortality of breast cancer worldwide, for example:</b> Bray F, Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, Siegel RL, Torre LA, Jemal A. Global cancer statistics 2018: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries [published correction appears in CA Cancer J Clin. 2020 Jul;70(4):313]. <i>CA Cancer J Clin.</i> 2018;68(6):394-424. doi:10.3322/caac.21492</li> </ul> <p><b>Methods:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Table 1 should be indicated on the second paragraph in this section.</li> </ul> <p><b>Results:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The topic "Results" needs to be placed correctly.</li> <li>• There are a lot of unnecessary spaces between paragraphs.</li> <li>• It is described "The mean age of the women was about 28 years". However, on Table 2 the average shown is 24.7 years.</li> <li>• Some percentages showed in Figure 2 are different from what is described in the text.</li> <li>• There are cited references not according Vancouver style in the text and in the Reference section, for example: In the Introduction: About 250,000 cases of breast cancer are seen in Nigeria each year and nearly 10,000 deaths recorded (9).</li> <li>• There are minor misspellings to correct, for example: "behavioural", "centres", "owerri"</li> <li>• The title of Figures and Tables need better delimitation, please add information about the sample studied (Who), the location (Where), and the year of study (When).</li> <li>• Table 2 and Table 4 need to be corrected about the final quantity of women interviewed and the percentages need to be revisited to sum 100%.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>Title suggestion:</b> Knowledge and Practice of breast cancer screening among <b>rural</b> women in South-Eastern Nigeria: A cross-sectional study.</p> <p>Figure 1 may be excluded once the data is already described on the text.</p> <p><b>Results:</b> <b>The data is described in duplicity in the text and in the Tables.</b></p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b> To describe on the text only the major percentage for each question, letting the readers visit the Tables to see the total description of the results.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>More information is needed in order to answer this question. For while, there is no information about the approval of this research in an Ethic Committee, neither about how women were approached to participate in the study.</p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Yonna Costa Barbosa</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Federal University of Maranhão, Brazil</i></b>