



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Research Journal of Oncology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJO_61661
Title of the Manuscript:	FACTORS INFLUENCING ACCESS TO ONCOLOGY SPECIALIZED HEALTH CARE SERVICES IN UASIN GISHU COUNTY, KENYA
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/journal/10/editorial-policy> )



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Important research for the area of oncology, high potential for public intervention and new studies. However, the text needs to be adapted to the journal's guidelines, it needs to be more concise and clear. Accepted for publication, but provided the attached suggestions are met.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Evaluation 61661 Introduction: - define the terms: acceptability of oncology services, affordability of oncology services, availability of oncology specialized healthcare services, location of oncology services, oncology services, tertiary healthcare services, uptake of oncology specialized healthcare services. So that it is clear in the results what each one refers to.</p> <p>There is no need for a literature review chapter. The same can be described in the introduction in a concise and clear way.</p> <p>Methodology: - A paragraph is not necessary to describe what the methodology will present. Initially, the methodology can already be described, such as study type, sample, data collection instrument and data analysis; - Research Ethics Committee approval was lacking; - In the exclusion criterion: rewrite the criterion of 18 years of age, because in the inclusion criterion, minors under 18 years of age can participate as long as their parents / guardians have consented. However, under the exclusion criterion, minors under 18 who are not able to make decisions on their own. Children under 18 alone cannot make decisions on their own and therefore need parental / guardian consent to participate in the research. Therefore, I think that under the exclusion criterion, minors under 18 years of age who did not have the consent of their parents and / or guardians cannot participate in the survey and not only minors under 18 years of age who cannot answer on their own. - When sampling, the number used in the sample is not clear. Describe how many participants the study had.</p> <p>The table must contain double spacing according to the magazine's rules. Location and year were missing from the table title. The footnote must be in lowercase and superscript (Cronbach Alpha (<math>\alpha</math>) = 0.941; N = 5). The source must contain the name of the report, of the study, with location and year in which it was carried out. (Example: SILVA, T.H. Factors influencing access to oncology specialized health care services in uasin gishu county, kenya. Kenya, 2018.</p> <p>Results: - which was very good for being above 69%. Explain. - There is data from the sample in the results that should be in the methodology and in the results. The results should only contain the results found. In the item on the socio-demographic information of the interviewees, only the sociodemographic information should be included, such as: age, sex, marital status, place of residence, education, profession / occupation. - Tables 1 and 2 lack the full title, such as location and year. Be like the sources of the paintings. In addition, these tables are part of the analysis of the methodology data and should not be in the results. The results should include only the result of applying the Likert scale and not the Likert scale. - In table 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 put the complete title and source. The title was missing, location and year the primary study was carried out. And the source lacks the author's name, the title of the research from which the table was taken, location and year. - Check the magazine's norm for the P value: Guideline for P-value reporting: P is always italicized and capitalized.</p>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>i) Correct expression: (P = 0.05). Wrong expression: (P &lt;.05), unless P &lt;.001.</p> <p>ii) The P value must be expressed in 2 digits, whether significant or not. If P &lt;0.01, it must be expressed with 3 digits.</p> <p>iii) When rounding, 3 digits are acceptable if rounding changes the significance of a value (for example, P = 0.049 rounded to 0.05).</p> <p>iv) Expressing P with more than 3 significant digits does not add useful information, since accurate P values with extreme results are sensitive to bias or deviations from the statistical model.</p> <p>v) Report of actual P values avoids this problem of interpretation. P values should not be listed as non-significant (NS), since, for meta-analysis, actual values are important and not providing exact P values is a form of incomplete reporting.</p> <p>vi) Do not use 0 before the decimal point for the P, alpha and beta statistical values because they cannot be equal to 1.</p> <p>Quotes: - Correct the form of quotation. The author's name must not appear. Rather, place the reference number corresponding to that quote and in square brackets (Example: [1]).</p> <p>References: Review references, as the research is in alphabetical order and must be numbered in the order in which they appear in the text. Correct the entire reference. They are outside the standard of the magazine. All references in the text must be cited. Review the magazine's norm.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Renata Miranda de Sousa</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal University of the State of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil</b>