

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Oncology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJO_124972
Title of the Manuscript:	CANCER CARE IN NIGERIA: IDENTIFYING GAPS AND OPPORTUNITY FOR IMPROVEMENT IN TEACHING HOSPITAL SETTINGS.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

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.	This manuscript is crucial for the scientific community because it addresses the significant challenges faced by the healthcare system in Nigeria, particularly in the context of cancer care. By identifying gaps and opportunities for improvement in teaching hospitals, it provides a foundation for actionable interventions to enhance cancer treatment outcomes. I appreciate the manuscript for its potential to guide policy reforms and improve clinical practices in resource-limited settings. However, a limitation might be the need for more granular data to address the regional disparities in healthcare access and outcomes across the country.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "CANCER CARE IN NIGERIA: IDENTIFYING GAPS AND OPPORTUNITY FOR IMPROVEMENT IN TEACHING HOSPITAL SETTINGS" is clear and descriptive but could be refined for better flow and precision. An alternative title could be: "Cancer Care in Nigerian Teaching Hospitals: Gaps, Challenges, and Opportunities for Improvement" This version maintains focus on the specific context (teaching hospitals) and clearly presents both the challenges and potential improvements.	

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract provides a clear overview of the study but could benefit from a few refinements for clarity and completeness:</p> <p>Suggestions for improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Participants description: The results mention "45 patients," which seems to be an error as the study focuses on healthcare workers, not patients. This should be corrected to refer to the 45 healthcare workers surveyed. More specific findings: The abstract should emphasize key findings more clearly, such as the percentage of workers unfamiliar with a national cancer care policy or specific areas where oncology training is lacking. Including these details would strengthen the results and make the abstract more informative. Conclusion: The conclusion could be slightly expanded to reflect both the financial barriers and the need for systemic improvements in training and policy awareness. This would give a more balanced view of the study's main findings. <p>Revised conclusion suggestion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "The study discovered that high treatment costs are a major barrier to effective cancer care in Nigeria. It also revealed significant gaps in oncology training and policy awareness among healthcare professionals, indicating a need for more comprehensive educational and systemic reforms to improve cancer care outcomes." <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Terminology: The phrase "Western world disease" might sound outdated. Consider replacing it with "previously more prevalent in high-income countries." <p>Final Suggestion:</p> <p>The abstract could mention the specific gaps in policy awareness and training integration, while also noting that a significant percentage of healthcare workers lack confidence in handling oncology cases. This would make the abstract more aligned with the core findings of the study.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>		
<p>introduction</p>	<p>The introduction provides a detailed background on cancer care in Nigeria and other countries, but there are areas where it could be refined for clarity, focus, and flow. Here are some suggestions:</p> <p>1. Clarification and Refinement of Key Points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opening sentence: Consider being more specific. Instead of "if measures are not enforced, it will continue to increase because of many factors," you could state, "if adequate preventive and treatment measures are not implemented, cancer rates will continue to rise due to factors such as increasing life expectancy, environmental factors, and limited access to healthcare." Global Comparison: You've included comparisons to Kenya and Ghana, which are helpful, but it would be beneficial to further emphasize why Nigeria's cancer policy has lagged behind, in terms of resource allocation, training, and healthcare infrastructure. More details on what is lacking in Nigeria's policy compared to Ghana and Kenya would enhance this comparison. <p>2. Data on Healthcare Workers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Since your study focuses on healthcare workers' perspectives in teaching hospitals, the introduction should incorporate this earlier. You could mention that healthcare professionals are central to effective cancer care, and their insights into gaps in training and resource 	

Review Form 3

	<p>availability are crucial for understanding how to improve the system.</p> <p>3. Cultural and Social Factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The section discussing herbal treatment and psychosocial issues is relevant but could be better integrated into the broader discussion. You could emphasize that cultural beliefs, misinformation, and economic hardship are barriers that healthcare workers face when trying to deliver effective care. <p>4. Accessibility and Infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The point about the lack of radiation therapy machines is critical. You could place this earlier in the introduction to emphasize the severity of resource scarcity in Nigeria. <p>5. Flow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The section on the Nigerian cancer policy could be moved towards the middle of the introduction, as it would help establish a clear context for why your study is essential in identifying gaps in care. The last paragraph would benefit from mentioning the potential of the study to highlight the importance of training and education for healthcare workers, which ties into the theme of your manuscript. 	
<p>Methodology</p>	<p>The Methodology section provides a good overview, but it could be improved for clarity, structure, and completeness. Here are some suggestions:</p> <p>1. Study Design and Setting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Repetitiveness: The first two sentences repeat the location of the study. You could combine them for better flow. Contextualizing the setting: While mentioning that UNTH is one of the first-generation hospitals and has the best hands, you could clarify why this context is important. It would also be beneficial to briefly describe the oncology unit's capacity (e.g., number of beds, patient volume) to give readers a better understanding of the setting. <p>2. Study Population and Instrument:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study population: It might be helpful to specify the different types of healthcare workers included (e.g., doctors, nurses, radiologists) to provide clarity on the professional diversity of the respondents. Questionnaire details: Provide more information about the structure of the questionnaire (e.g., how many sections, the type of questions—multiple choice, Likert scale, etc.). It would also help to mention if the questionnaire was validated or if it was designed specifically for this study. Outcome variables: You might want to elaborate on the specific variables the questionnaire assessed, like "training adequacy, confidence in handling oncology cases, economic barriers to patient care, and awareness of cancer policies." <p>3. Improvement Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sample size: If possible, include information about how the sample size of 45 was determined (was it based on convenience sampling, or was there a specific rationale behind it?). This could enhance the credibility of the study design. Ethics and Consent: You might want to mention whether ethical approval was obtained, and 	

Review Form 3

	<p>whether participants gave informed consent before filling out the questionnaire.</p>	
<p>The Data Analysis and Results</p>	<p>The Data Analysis and Results sections are generally well-organized, but there are a few areas where they can be improved for clarity, precision, and readability. Here are some suggestions:</p> <p>Data Analysis:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Software and Statistical Methods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Instead of simply stating that IBM SPSS was used, you could elaborate on the specific statistical methods or tests employed (e.g., chi-square tests, t-tests) to analyze relationships or compare groups. ○ Clarify which "clinical outcomes," "pharmacoeconomic outcomes," and "quality of life assessments" were analyzed if this data is part of your study. 2. Outcome Definitions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Clarify what "clinical outcomes" and "pharmacoeconomic outcomes" refer to in your study (e.g., confidence in treating cancer, perception of treatment costs by healthcare workers). <p>Results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Consistency and Clarity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There's some redundancy in reporting the oncology training and experience (e.g., the statement about "most of our respondents claim to have attended an oncology training" repeats information from the previous sentence). You can streamline this to avoid repetition. ○ Ensure consistent terminology when referring to different groups or variables (e.g., "handling cancer patients" vs. "handling oncology cases"). 4. Key Findings Highlighted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ You might want to highlight the significant findings more explicitly. For example, the relatively low percentage of respondents with more than 5 years of experience handling cancer cases and the high percentage who have not attended oncology training should be emphasized because these are critical gaps that affect the quality of care. <p><input type="checkbox"/> Table Presentation:</p> <p>You could move the Socio-Demographics Table to an appendix or mention in-text that "detailed socio-demographic characteristics are shown in Table 1."</p> <p>Additionally, make sure the symbols (e.g., "=>" in the age category) are consistently formatted as symbols or text.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Key Statistical Findings:</p> <p>Include any important statistical results, such as p-values or confidence intervals, if available, for comparisons between groups (e.g., gender differences in training attendance).</p>	
<p>Discussion</p>	<p>The Discussion section covers a lot of essential points but could benefit from a clearer structure, fewer repetitions, and more concise explanations. Here are some suggestions for improvement:</p> <p>General Structure and Flow:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Divide into Subheadings: 	

Review Form 3

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Instead of just listing “Clinical Outcomes,” “Pharmacoeconomic Outcomes,” “Oncology Training and Readiness,” and “National Cancer Policy,” ensure that each subheading clearly answers specific research questions or aligns with your study’s objectives. ○ Start with a summary of key findings for each section before comparing to other studies. <p>2. Reduce Repetition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some points, such as financial hardship due to the cost of cancer treatments, are repeated multiple times. It would be more effective to mention them once and discuss them thoroughly. <p>3. Clarify Contradictions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some comparisons with other studies seem contradictory. For instance, healthcare workers in your study think there are enough trained oncology personnel, but you later state there are only around 100 oncologists for a large population. Clarify these points to explain the discrepancy between perception and reality. <p>4. Be Specific with Data and Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ When discussing studies that differ from your findings, clearly describe why this might be (e.g., differences in healthcare systems, sample sizes, training structures). 	
<p>Conclusion and Recommendation</p>	<p>Your Conclusion and Recommendation section provides solid suggestions, but it can be refined to improve clarity, coherence, and impact. Here are some suggestions:</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Summarize Key Findings: Make sure the conclusion emphasizes the key findings of your study in a clear and concise way. 2. Avoid General Statements: The statement “Cancer is a global health issue and should be tackled using any means possible” is true but too broad. Focus more on the specific gaps identified in your study. <p>Recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Be More Action-Oriented: The recommendations should clearly suggest actionable steps for improving cancer care based on your findings. Group related recommendations together for clarity (e.g., financial accessibility, education and training, policy, interprofessional collaboration). <p>Additional Suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strengthen the Importance of Specialized Oncology Programs: Reinforce the idea that standardized, specialized training should be mandatory for all oncology professionals, and emphasize the need for continuous professional development. 2. Connect Recommendations to the Bigger Picture: In some instances, you may want to relate your recommendations to broader goals, such as improving patient survival rates, reducing cancer-related mortality, and enhancing the overall quality of life for cancer patients in Nigeria. 	
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness through its comprehensive study design and rigorous data analysis, employing established methods to assess the gaps in cancer care among healthcare workers in Nigeria. The use of a cross-sectional observational study design allows for a thorough examination of the current state of oncology care and the perspectives of healthcare professionals in a teaching hospital setting. The incorporation of well-defined metrics, such as socio-demographic characteristics and clinical outcomes, further strengthens the technical soundness of the</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>study. Additionally, the alignment of findings with existing literature, coupled with a critical analysis of the healthcare landscape in Nigeria, enhances the manuscript's credibility and relevance to ongoing discussions in oncology care and policy development.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>=</p>	<p>The references listed for your manuscript appear to be comprehensive and relevant to the topic of cancer care in Nigeria and globally. Here are a few observations and suggestions regarding the references:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Relevance and Variety: The references include a mix of studies on cancer epidemiology, treatment barriers, healthcare policy, and patient care experiences. This variety helps provide a well-rounded foundation for your study.2. Diversity of Sources: It's good to see that the references include journal articles, national policy documents, and reports from reputable organizations. This strengthens the credibility of the manuscript.3. Use of Recent Literature: Ensure that the references are as current as possible. While some older studies are valuable, including more recent research can reflect the latest trends and findings in oncology.4. Formatting Consistency: Make sure that the formatting of the references is consistent throughout the list (e.g., journal titles, volume and issue numbers, DOI links). This improves the professionalism and readability of the manuscript.5. Citations in Text: Ensure that every reference in the list is properly cited within the text of the manuscript. This demonstrates the relevance of each source to the findings and discussions presented.6. Verify Access: Ensure that the URLs provided for online resources are functional and lead directly to the cited material. It's also helpful to check if any of the references are accessible to readers who may not have institutional access to certain journals.7. Diversity of Perspectives: Including references from various regions and contexts can enhance the manuscript's robustness. While many references focus on Nigeria and Africa, consider incorporating global perspectives that may provide useful comparisons or insights.8. Historical Context: Including foundational studies on cancer care that may have shaped current practices or policies can provide valuable context for your research. <p>Overall, the references appear to be appropriate for scholarly communication, supporting the manuscript's claims and findings effectively.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are areas that could benefit from improvement for clarity and readability. Here are some suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clarity and Conciseness: Some sentences are lengthy and may confuse readers. Breaking them into shorter, more concise statements can enhance understanding. Consistency in Terminology: Ensure that terms are used consistently throughout the manuscript. For instance, the use of "healthcare workers" vs. "healthcare professionals" should be standardized. Grammar and Punctuation: There are minor grammatical errors and punctuation issues that need attention. For example, ensure proper use of commas, periods, and conjunctions for better flow. Technical Jargon: While some level of technical language is expected in scholarly articles, it's important to balance this with explanations for broader accessibility. Overall Flow: Enhancing the overall flow of paragraphs and sections can improve the manuscript's readability. Consider using topic sentences and transitions between ideas for better coherence. <p>Addressing these points will improve the manuscript's quality and make it more effective for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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></p>
<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>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Mathew Varghese V</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>AIIMS, India</p>