

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Cancer and Tumor International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JCTI_102237</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>"An Insight into South Sudan's Health System: A Comprehensive Assessment of Interventions for Women's Cervical Cancer Screening"</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Short 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.journaljcti.com/index.php/JCTI/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>Yes, the manuscript important for scientific society as the research is centred on interventions for boosting the uptake of cervical cancer vaccines among women.</b></p> <p>2. <b>I believe the article is suitable. A little adjustment to the title was subjected in he reviewed manuscript.</b></p> <p>3. <b>The abstract is comprehensive.</b></p> <p>4. <b>The sub-sections is appropriate but words are lumped together. The structure is too tight for easy reading.</b></p> <p>5. <b>The manuscript is scientifically correct.</b></p> <p>6. <b>The references are sufficient and very recent. The writers did a good job of using materials. Vey commendable.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Language quality is suitable for scholarly communication	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The writers should please see other remarks in the manuscript.	

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

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