

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Oncology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJO_107367
Title of the Manuscript:	Restoration of Chemo-surveillance as a Top Priority to Save Cancer Patients
Type of the Article	Review Article

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>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? (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>1. The manuscript is important for scientific community. This manuscript discusses about Restoration of Chemo-surveillance as a Top Priority to Save Cancer Patients. This discussion is still considered interesting in the field of cancer management.</p> <p>2. Yes, it is.</p> <p>3. No, it isn't. Abstract usually consist of background, methods/design of the study, results, and conclusion. I did'nt find the methods or design of the study in the abstract of this manuscript.</p> <p>4. If the manuscript is literature review, the structure and subsections are appropriate</p> <p>5. I don't think so. In some paragraphs, I think the interpretation is not really relevant. For example, the author states that "Cancer therapies based on the killing of CCs are not a good choice, because such therapies can only benefit the minority of early stage cancer patients whose chemo-surveillance has not yet fatally damaged, whereas the majority of advanced cancer patients whose chemo-surveillance has been fatally damaged cannot be saved by such therapies". It's only from one literature and the author does not present adequate data to make such interpretation.</p> <p>6. I think the references can still be improved</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. I think the English quality of this manuscript can still be improved</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The topic is actually interesting, and some of the presented data is already good. However, the author should be more careful when making interpretations. It is advisable to draw interpretations from multiple sources to enhance the validity. Present supporting data, which can also include diagrams, images, or illustrations. In my opinion, the statement that state cancer is caused by unhealed wounds needs improvement. As far as I know, the fundamental cause of cancer is DNA mutations, which can occur due to various reasons. While some studies suggest that unhealed wounds can contribute to cancer. The statements in this manuscript seem to predominantly support the idea that cancer is solely caused by non-healing wounds. It would be better to revise the sentence and state that one of the known causes of cancer is non-healing wounds. Additionally, I noticed some repetitive sentences; it's advisable to avoid sentence repetition and consider paraphrasing instead.</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:	Ikhwan Rinaldi
Department, University & Country	Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia