

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Applied Life Sciences International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JALSI_98666
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of hormone quantification as an orientation screening in the diagnosis of hormone-dependent breast cancers in women in Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire.
Type of the 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.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 <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. Yes, this finding has a good information 2. Yes, it is suitable. 3. Yes, however, the "AIM" is too long and does not reflect the AIM. 4. Yes 5. Yes 6. Yes, but 17 of 38 references were published in more than 10 years, so it is better to change with the newest references	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes, the quality of the language is good, but it is suggested to change some sentences which use plural first-person pronouns ("we", "our", and "us") --> into passive sentences.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	None	

### 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>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hendig Winarno
Department, University & Country	Indonesia