



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Oncology
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

	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>As it is an observational, cross-sectional study, the STROBE guidelines must be followed as established in the authors' guidelines and they are not met in the following aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Description of the relevant setting, places and dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, monitoring and data collection. - Does not clearly specify the sources and methods of selection of the participants. - Does not explain what was done with the missing data (missing data) - Does not describe the reasons for the loss of participants in each phase (recruitment, exposure, follow-up and data collection) <p>- The characteristics described in section 4.1 do not correspond to the socio-demographic characteristics, such as age (average), sex, places of origin, rural or urban, among others, and some clinical characteristics such as diagnoses, in addition to the characteristics described as time of illness and assistance to health institutions.</p> <p>Although the manuscript meets the requirement of not exceeding 25 pages, however, it has 11,723 words, so it does not follow the recommendation established in the guidelines for authors in research articles where it is advisable to have an extension of 3000 to 6000 words. Abstract: It is not structured in subsections and exceeds 300 words (it has 418 words)</p> <p>Study limitations are not mentioned. There is also no declaration of conflict of interest or establish the contribution of each author</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some subsections exceed the three established levels. - The keywords must be between 4 and 8 however they exceed the limits placing almost complete phrases. 	
Optional/General comment		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rita Mireya Navas Perozo
Department, University & Country	University Of Zulia, Venezuela