

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Oncology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJO_94199
Title of the Manuscript:	AWARENESS OF CERVICAL CANCER AND ITS SCREENING AMONG POST-NATAL CLIENTS AT A TERTIARY HOSPITAL IN NIGERIA.
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:

(<https://www.journalirjo.com/index.php/IRJO/editorial-policy>)

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>Abstract</p> <p>Should start with a background which gives a brief overview of the topic. The aims is part of the background.</p> <p>Study design, Place and Duration of Study – this should be part of the methodology.</p> <p>Results and conclusions – should be results only. Discussion is not a necessity in the abstract, especially if it is shallow.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>Join paragraphs 3 and 4. Both talk about risk factors.</p> <p>“The 6th-week postnatal clinic (PNC) affords the opportunity for women to be screened for cervical epithelial cell abnormalities using cervical smear (Pap smear) cytology to detect the premalignant stages of this deadly but preventable disease for appropriate management.” – please cite this, its an interesting finding.</p> <p>Methodology</p> <p>Why was this study area selected?</p> <p>What reasons do the authors have for excluding women below 18? Does the clinic attend to pregnant women 18 years and below?</p> <p>I don't think that is how Q is calculated. It is supposed to be 1- 0.003. please make a clear substitution of this for us to see.</p> <p>Replace each variable with a number.</p> <p>Authors state that the questionnaire is made up of 3 sections but they explain only 2 (A & B).</p> <p>The study procedure is more of consenting process. These are two different things.</p> <p>Discussions</p> <p>3rd sentence starting “The findings (though worse) are similar....” – something cannot be worse and similar at the same time.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>The title should read “Awareness and associated factors....”</p> <p>Importance of the study? It looks like several studies of the kind have been carried out in the country.</p> <p>Edits on the language is necessary</p>	

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:	Violet Dismas Kajogoo
Department, University & Country	Damax Solutions, Tanzania