

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Oncology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJO_97819
Title of the Manuscript:	Cancer Moonshot to Bring Hope for Desperate Cancer Patients
Type of the Article	Commentary

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	It is an article that goes to the comments section or opinion article. 1.- The abstract must be clearer and have 250 words. 2.-The introduction must contain the problematization of the subject to be discussed in a clear and concise manner, with current bibliographical citations. 3.-In the development of the article there is zero clarity regarding the topic of: Cancer Moonshot to Inspire Hope for Desperate Terminal Cancer Patients, which is the topic on which much of the article is based, there are no bibliographical citations, much less a plan clear ideology around this program. 4.-Conclusions; They must be prospective and substantiated. 5.-Sufficient bibliography.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	APPROPRIATE	
Optional/General comments	Submit again with the mentioned adjustments	

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:	Donovan Casas Patiño
Department, University & Country	Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México, México