

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Oncology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJO_117460
Title of the Manuscript:	KNOWLEDGE AND PERCEPTION OF PROSTATE CANCER AMONG MALES IN RURAL COMMUNITIES IN ESAN NORTH EAST LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF EDO STATE
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalirjo.com/index.php/IRJO/editorial-policy>)

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><u>Compulsory</u> 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>Yes, this is an interesting, well-written paper. I applaud the authors for their efforts in exploring the awareness. Prostate cancer screening and awareness are very important factors in management, and the authors have quoted this well. The results are interesting, which show that more awareness is required among the population in that area.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>I have few suggestions. It could be beneficial to condense the introduction, perhaps by incorporating the reference literature that demonstrates the lack of awareness into the discussion. Separating the results and discussion sections might enhance the readability for the readers.</p> <p>Yes, it highlights the need for awareness on prostate cancer screening in the specific locality.</p> <p>Kindly check for the reference format.</p> <p>It would be nice if the authors could mention the various components of prostate cancer screening, as this would help readers understand, learn, and benefit from the article.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Arjun Pon Avudaiappan
Department, University & Country	United States