

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIMPS_126045
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATING DISPARITIES AND HEALTH OUTCOMES AMONG CANCER PATIENTS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>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.</p>	<p>This paper is a good step in the direction of closing gaps in treatment outcomes in the community served by this hospital. More research exploring disparities in treatment outcomes is needed to improve healthcare in all populations and this paper has the potential to add to that pool by providing information about west African communities. This area of the world is often ignored or dismissed because of a variety of prejudices but deserves to be included in academic research. This manuscript demonstrates a willingness to contribute to this area of study. The explanation and discussion of the results would benefit from some edits to provide the reader with more clarity so readers understand how important their contribution is to the scientific community.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, but I do think that the title could be more specific regarding the population of cancer patients. <i>Evaluating Disparities in Healthcare Outcomes of UNTH, Enugu Oncology Patients</i></p>	
<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, overall, provides and accurate summary of the paper. There are some grammatical errors that need to be addressed. The results section of the abstract would benefit from greater focus on the most significant analytic results. For example, more information about what demographic identifiers, or combination of identifiers, had the most statistically significant best and worst outcomes.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<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>I do think that the scientific correctness overall is robust. The Pearson correlation and analytical tools used were appropriate choices for the scope of the study and survey results are clearly listed in the tables. I also appreciate the addition of explanatory footnotes after the Pearson analysis table – I think that this adds to the accessibility of the paper. Perhaps in a subsequent paper, the writers may increase their sample size and perform a more in-depth multivariate analysis of the outcomes. They may also include more specific and quantifiable measures of positive and negative outcomes to their data collection tool.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>I do feel that the references are recent and sufficient.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>In the current iteration, the language is not suitable for scholarly communication. With some adjustments, this paper could easily achieve the appropriate quality of writing for publication. The writers may consider requesting assistance from a professional editor.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 3

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:	Akili Smith-Washington
Department, University & Country	United States