



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Oncology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AORJ_53034
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness of intervention on awareness and knowledge of breast self-examination among the potentially at risk population for breast cancer
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. In general, grammar writing of the manuscript is not adequate, which makes it difficult to read. Style correction is recommended.</p> <p>2. The paper had as objective to estimate the effectiveness of intervention on awareness and knowledge of breast cancer (BC) and breast self-examination, however there is not a description about the educational strategy used. However, at conclusions authors talk about a pamphlet. A clear description of the strategy should be included in Methodology.</p> <p>3. The questionnaire applied to the students must be included as extra-material to be analyzed.</p> <p>4. It is not clear if it is a probabilistic sample or is a sample for convenience, since they mention calculation of sample size and on the other hand they speak of sample for convenience. Did they calculate a sample size of the students of the pharmacy faculty? then specify the total population, number of men and women and how the sample size was determined.</p> <p>5. The design of the table 1 should be improved.</p> <p>6. The approach of the answers in table 2 is not correct. Instead of "correct" or "incorrect", it should say "yes" or "no". How they interpreted those "yes" or "no" should go in the text</p> <p>7. The interpretation in the text must in any case state which answers are considered adequate or not.</p> <p>8. The authors did not define which were the correct answers. For example, in question 3 (table 3), it is not clear which answer they interpreted as correct.</p> <p>9. Some concepts in the questionnaire are not correct. The presence of a breast lump or bloody discharge through the nipple are not risk factors, but rather, data suggestive of a neoplasm.</p> <p>10. In questions such as "What should be looked for during BSE?" it is not clear if it is necessary to choose one option. Or more than one.</p> <p>11. Some tables are not necessary.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The manuscript has serious methodological problems that must be corrected	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ana Laura Calderón Garcidueñas
Department, University & Country	Universidad Veracruzana, Mexico