



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Oncology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJO_55055
Title of the Manuscript:	Awareness, Knowledge and Attitude towards Breast Self-Examination: A Cross-Sectional Study among Female Pharmacy Students in Malaysia
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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The following observations and suggestions are made:</p> <p>Abstract Line 8 – Faculty of Pharmacy. Upper case for F& P. Line 9 – Capital S for State Line 12 – Insert “based items” after attitude.</p> <p>Introduction Line 14 -15 The sentence does not make sense if the last six words are joined. You may break the sentence and then put in what you omitted in the next sentence. You should also justify your study at this point. According to the author, similar studies have been carried out in other places since the introduction of BSE, why are you replicating studies. You need to proffer cogent reason. In other words what does your study add to existing knowledge on the subject matter. -The number of studies you cited in your reference list whose respondents cover female dental students, health workers, nurses, females in medical and non-medical colleges, market women, female secondary and tertiary students, textile workers etc. belie your claim for your choice of population. Studies have been carried out on both health and non-health workers.</p> <p>Materials and Methods -What is the actual population of your study? -Stating the figure adds to the credibility of the study.</p> <p>Results and Discussion -You may include your criteria for the results in the report.. It makes it clearer. -Pls cross-check questionnaire items 2,11,15,17 and 18 and correct/ recast to bring out what respondents understood during administration of instrument. -Do not leave any heading stand alone in the previous page. See 3.3 -I suggest you recast questionnaire item number 15 to read “ I will recommend the practice of regular BSE to family members and friends’</p> <p>Discussion -Give source of your statement that few studies have reported that early detection of BC through BSE are non-existent,... - You cited a 2000 publication to support your claim. Clearly a more recent study gives more authenticity. Give a better source for authenticity and credibility.</p> <p>Competing Interests Disclaimer Authors referred to products used for research and producing company. I found no relevance for such in the manuscript. The study was on Awareness and knowledge of breast cancer and attitude to breast self-examination. Which product was used? The author's comment in this section casts doubt on the authenticity and originality of the study. The onus is on the author to explain.</p> <p>REFERENCES I don't know the referencing style the author used. It was observed that there were instances where too many authors were listed. For instance 9 authors and 11 authors were fully listed in numbers 2 and 4 respectively of the reference list. Cross-check with the recommended style. Author should stick to the template of publisher.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

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>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Obiageli Chinyelu Chukwuemerie</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Nnamdi Azikiwe University Nigeria, Nigeria</i>