

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JOCAMR_96064</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of Exercise program on cancer related fatigue and quality of life among patients undergoing cancer treatment -Pilot study (Part-2)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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.journaljocamr.com/index.php/JOCAMR/editorial-policy> )

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>It is important as it is related to management of fatigue in cancer patients.</p> <p>Evaluation of impact of Exercise program on cancer related fatigue and quality of life among Breast, Gynecological, Head and Neck cancer patients</p> <p>Yes, it is comprehensive</p> <p>Few notable discrepancies are there.</p> <p>Needs improvement</p> <p>Sufficient</p> <p>Comments provided, separately</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>OK</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The paper attempt to examine the impact of Exercise program on cancer related fatigue.</li> <li>Sample size: It is not clear when the <b>sample size was calculated to be 100</b> for each group, why authors have decided to present the <b>results of only 30 subjects</b> that too of only one group instead of two groups in the present study?</li> <li>Reliability score: It is surprising why the reliability score pertains to <b>only 20 subjects not 30 as decided by them?</b></li> <li>Pooling of cancer cases: It is expected that fatigue scores will be different by different type of cancers like the fatigue experienced by the breast cancer subjects would be different from that experience by the subjects with Head or Neck cancer. In view of this, it was idle to treat them as three separate groups and present the results. Otherwise.</li> <li>Show that the initial fatigue scores are comparable between three types of cancers.</li> <li>How are authors sure that the fatigue score obtained at Post 3 (After 90 days) are only due to exercise regime and not due to <b>time effect?</b></li> <li>Are there studies to show that the fatigue score continues to remain same even after 90 days? Under this assumption only, we can say that the changes observed in fatigue scores at Post 3 are due to exercise regime adopted.</li> <li>In Table 4, there is no data presented for Post 3. In fact, it is the Post 3 fatigue scores that are showing significant rise from that of Initial scores. So, missing of data for Post 4 in</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	Table 4, is surprising. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• How is quality of life scores are obtained? Mention it in the methodology.</li></ul>	
--	---	--

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<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>Ramnath Takiar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>India</b>