

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_107698
Title of the Manuscript:	An Institutional-Based Cross-Sectional Study of Factors Associated with ever having a Breast Lump in Women visiting a Breast Cancer Clinic in Ghana
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>Compulsory 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? NO (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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes. The manuscript is rich and can be utilized by the scientific community.</p> <p>Factors Associated with Women having Breast Lump in Ghana: A Cross-Sectional Study.</p> <p>The abstract is concise and smart. I applaud how the</p> <p>YES,</p> <p>Very adequate and resourceful research especially to the awareness of breast cancer as a result of breast lump in women – Target population (Ghana). References are sufficient so far.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Most Definitely.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In my opinion, the paper is good overall. The content of this paper is relatively adequate, and the author has done appropriate preparation and work on this topic. To be precise, analysis in the main body is very insightful. The author also draws a meaningful conclusion. However, there are still some parts that need to be updated in the paper. The author is advised to make some reviews so that the paper will be better.</p>	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Runyi Francis
Department, University & Country	Federal Polytechnic, Nigeria