

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Pathogen Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_101571
Title of the Manuscript:	Breast Cancer: Is Breast Self-Examination Key to Freedom from Regrets and Pain?
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.journalijpr.com/index.php/IJPR/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><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>	<p>YES .It is important for scientific community.</p> <p>Yes.the title of the article is suitable</p> <p>Yes .the abstract of the article Is comprehensive.</p> <p>Yes .subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate</p> <p>Yes . I think the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>NO.The references are not up-to-date,references of the last 10 years should be cited,please cite last 10 years references ,especially references for the last 5 years.</p> <p><u>Apart from above mentioned 6 points, there are additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> <p>1. the part of dicussion is not well discussed combined with results and references and should make some modifications.</p> <p>2.The language is not fluent ,suggesting that it should be edited by an english native editor.</p> <p>3..The conclusion should be concise and only summarize the most important contribution of the research.</p> <p>4.The tables should use the format of 3-line table,please revise the format of the tables to 3-line table,especially Table2,and table3.</p> <p>5.References should be numbered uniformly and mark it with a numerical superscript in the corresponding parts of the paper.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is not fluent ,suggesting that it should be edited by an english native editor.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Plase make large revisions, espically in the part of discussion ,conclusions, references,tables and languge-editing. After making large revisions,the paper may be considered for publication.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Changping Li
Department, University & Country	Southwest Medical University, China