

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_124525
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence and of abnormal cervical cytology in federal teaching hospital Gombe.
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article provides an insight on prevalence and situation of cervical cancers in the health care setting and critical in informing planning for women's health issues. The condition studies has significant health or mortality implications for local population and global health.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I would suggest a title be stated as "The prevalence of abnormal cytology at cervical cytology Gombe federal teaching hospital. A cross-sectional study. This is because you're looking at situation at one point in time with no follow up studies.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The Subheading "Objective" can be deleted and made as continuation of the introduction section of the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The methodology sections is not well explicit: I suggest it should be revised as follows; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The design of prospective study Must be stated example Retrospective cohort study? Or Cross-sectional studies are observational studies that analyze data from a population at a single point in time. They are often used to measure the prevalence of health outcomes • Statement of sampling technique • Inclusion and exclusion criteria • Data collection methods • Statistical analysis methods • Statement of ethical approval 	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is not scientifically robust but can be improved. This is because it provides relevant information that can be used to improve care for cancer patients. The peer review can help improve it if authors are willing to cooperate.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No objections as of now	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Revisit and correct typos. Over 50 grammar issues	
Optional/General comments	Revision of manuscript highly recommended	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Katwesige Wycliff
Department, University & Country	Euclid University, Uganda