

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Applied Life Sciences International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JALSI_98666</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Evaluation of hormone quantification as an orientation screening in the diagnosis of hormone-dependent breast cancers in women in Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Short communication</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.journaljalsi.com/index.php/JALSI/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></li> </ol>	<p><b>The manuscript might help improve the prognosis of BC patients. It involves a publication showing that the increase in breast cancer risk observed among postmenopausal Ivorian women may be predicted by a high level of plasma concentration of estradiol-2 in these women. There is a recommendation to monitor serum estradiol (E2) levels among a large sample population.</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b> <b>Yes</b> <b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>Yes.</b> If correct, prepare better second and third sentences in 3.3. Figure 2 presents the boxplot of the analysis on the comparison menopausal/non-menopausal (<math>p=0,03/p=0,1</math>). It shows which is the cause of ER+ tumors/ER- tumors. That should be an important finding in this case report; but I find the text confusing (eg. why (<math>P&lt;0.05</math>)?).</p> <p><b>Yes.</b> <b>First sentence in 2.1.1:</b> Remove the second use of this word ('Reception').</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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:	<b>Enrique Wulff</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>ICMAN-CSIC, Spain</b>