

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78156
Title of the Manuscript:	Assess the prevalence for needs of breast cancer survivors' in the oncology ward at a selected tertiary care hospital
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.journalpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Introduction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rewrite and rearrange the introduction section, since the background of the study is not clear. <p>Methodology:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The number participants and data collection period were small. Is patients who completed the primary treatment included? 2. What are the statistical analysis performed? Add more details? <p>Results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why people with third and fourth stage of cancer not included in this study? It may lead to bias. 2. Figure No.1 is not clear. Prefer replacing with more clear graphs. 3. "Age, education, occupation, income, age at menopause, marital status, number of children, breast feeding given, stage of cancer, surgical treatment received, personal habits, previous source of information, and exercise are all associated with the overall and physical needs of breast cancer survivors ($p > 0.05$)". If the P value is greater than 0.05, how these variables are associated with one and another. Explain? 4. Table 3: The P value is 0.09 for Family and spiritual Needs vs previous information and Health Insurance. But Family and spiritual Needs vs previous information considered as significant and But Family and spiritual Needs vs Health Insurance considered as non-significant. Why? 5. How previous information influence the of Breast Cancer Survivors? Needs to be discussed. <p>Discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Discussion part is poorly written. Only demographic profile of the participants discussed and compared with existing studies. However, primary objectives of this study are not discussed enough. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	M Arunkumar
Department, University & Country	PSG College of Arts and Science, India