

Review Form

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Oncology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJO_95411
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing molecular imaging for cancer diagnosis in Africa using Nigeria as a case study
Type of the Article	Minireview 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>)

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><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>The subject of the article is important for the development of public health policies in Nigeria. However, the methodology used in the questionnaire is not adequate.</i> 2. <i>It's a bit confusing and redundant. I suggest: "Nigerians' perception of the use of molecular imaging methods in cancer diagnosis".</i> 3. <i>Epidemiological data should not be included in the abstract.</i> 4. <i>Do not. After the Introduction, it is necessary to describe the objectives, methods of the bibliographic research and the questionnaire (with details), make a discussion (comparison with other similar studies in Nigeria) and conclude with the main findings of the survey.</i> 5. <i>No.</i> 6. <i>Yes, they're good.</i> <p><i>Comments: Write a structured summary that includes: introduction, objectives, methods, results and discussion. In the survey, there was a large sample heterogeneity, since both specialists and lay people were included in the same evaluation. I suggest conducting the survey only with the decision-making group (physicians).</i></p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Yes.</i> 	

Review Form 1.7

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marcel Vasconcellos
Department, University & Country	School of Medicine, Centro Universitário Serra dos Órgãos-UNIFESO, Brazil

Review Form 1.7

Created by: DR

Checked by: PM

Approved by: MBM

Version: 1.7 (15-12-2022)