

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</a>
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

<b>Compulsory</b> 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 contributes to the understanding of disparities in cancer outcomes among Nigerian patients, an under-researched population. By focusing on disparities related to socioeconomic factors, it highlights critical areas for intervention to improve cancer care in low-resource settings. I appreciate the detailed analysis of sociodemographic variables, particularly the gender disparities and the influence of economic status, which are vital for tailoring interventions. However, a deeper exploration of these disparities, beyond descriptive statistics, would further strengthen its impact.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is generally suitable but can be more specific to emphasize the focus on Nigeria. A suggested alternative: "Assessing Socioeconomic Disparities and Health Outcomes Among Cancer Patients in a Nigerian Teaching Hospital".	
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 abstract is clear but could benefit from slight modifications. It should mention specific disparities (such as income, gender) that were examined and include a brief statement about the implications of the findings. Additionally, it should clarify the conclusion regarding the correlation strength and significance of the disparities.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The flow from the introduction, methods, results, and discussion is logical and well-organized. However, the discussion section could better highlight how these findings can be used to reduce disparities.	
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 scientifically robust in its use of descriptive statistics and correlations to analyze disparities in health outcomes among cancer patients. It appropriately employs tools like Pearson correlation to examine relationships between variables such as age, income, and health outcomes. However, the lack of deeper multivariate analysis limits the manuscript's ability to draw more comprehensive conclusions about causal relationships. Despite this, the study is technically sound and addresses a relevant gap in the literature on cancer disparities in low-resource settings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references are adequate and include recent studies, though the inclusion of additional recent works on cancer disparities in sub-Saharan Africa could enhance the manuscript's relevance. For instance, more references on how similar studies were conducted in other low-income settings would provide a broader context for the findings.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English is generally clear but would benefit from minor grammatical corrections and improvements in flow. There are some awkward phrases, particularly in the results section, which could be smoothed out for better readability.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript is well-done in addressing disparities in cancer care, but expanding on recommendations for reducing these disparities would be beneficial. Additionally, the authors could explore potential policy changes based on their findings to make the manuscript more actionable for healthcare practitioners.  would give this manuscript a score of 7.5, suggesting that it requires Major Revision. The work is important and relevant, but improvements in data analysis, English language quality, and providing a clearer focus on actionable recommendations are necessary before publication.	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Kirolos Eskandar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Helwan University, Egypt</b>