

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Cancer and Tumor International
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_JCTI_118007
Title of the Manuscript:	PROFILE OF BREAST CANCER IN YOUNG WOMEN AT DR. MOEWARDI SURAKARTA
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.journaljcti.com/index.php/JCTI/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)
<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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes! Manuscript was important for scientific community I appreciate your contribution. 2. Title of the article does not follow the PICO format. 3. Study design & Methodology looks alike you need to write methodology more elaborately, concise with scientific manner. 4. In RESULTS AND DISCUSSION part you mentioned it as aged ≤40 years while in Inclusion Criteria it was mentioned as <40 years. 5. In inclusion criteria can you explain the meaning of "Histopathology results can be tracked" 6. Flow chart need to be corrected. 7. Can you provide ethical approval No. 8. Graphical representation is missing, if possible, include some histo image it will add more structure to the article. 9. If you add questioner form or CRF or ICD or patient information form it looks more scientific. 10. You need to check readability, sentence flow, and Grammarly it will be in a refine form. 11. More reference is needed. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>You need to check readability, sentence flow, and Grammarly it will be in a refine form.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Methodology has to be corrected, check discussion part.</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:	Murali Krishna Moka
Department, University & Country	Hindu Mission Hospital, India