

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Cancer and Tumor International |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JCTI_130064 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Evaluation of Hematological Parameters Pre and Post Chemotherapy in Breast Cancer patients among Sudanese Population in Khartoum state |
| Type of the Article | |

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community, particularly in the fields of oncology and hematology. The study's findings on the changes in hematological parameters pre- and post-chemotherapy in breast cancer patients provide valuable insights into the effects of chemotherapy on the hematological system. These insights can inform the development of strategies to mitigate chemotherapy-induced hematological toxicity, ultimately improving the quality of life and treatment outcomes for breast cancer patients. Furthermore, the study's focus on the Sudanese population helps address the gap in research on breast cancer in African countries, contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of the disease's global burden. | Noted |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | <p>"Evaluation of Hematological Parameters Pre and Post Chemotherapy in Breast Cancer patients among Sudanese Population in Khartoum state"</p> <p>While the title accurately reflects the content of the article, it's a bit lengthy and wordy. Here's a suggested alternative title:</p> <p>"Assessing Chemotherapy-Induced Hematological Changes in Sudanese Breast Cancer Patients"</p> <p>This title is more concise and directly conveys the main objective of the study. Alternatively, you could also consider these other options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Hematological Effects of Chemotherapy in Breast Cancer Patients: A Study among Sudanese Women" - "Chemotherapy-Related Hematological Toxicity in Sudanese Breast Cancer Patients: A Pre-Post Analysis" - "Impact of Chemotherapy on Hematological Parameters in Breast Cancer Patients from Sudan" | Title has been revised |

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 is well-structured and provides a good overview of the study. However, here are some suggestions to enhance its comprehensiveness:</p> <p>Suggestions for Addition</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Specific chemotherapy regimen: Consider mentioning the specific chemotherapy regimen used in the study to provide more context. 2. Sample size and population characteristics: While the abstract mentions the study population, it would be helpful to include the sample size and any relevant demographic characteristics (e.g., age range, menopausal status). 3. Key findings: Although the abstract mentions significant reductions in hematological parameters, it would be beneficial to include the actual values or percentages to give readers a better understanding of the magnitude of the changes. <p>Suggestions for Deletion or Modification</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Redundant phrases: The phrase "This study aims to evaluate the changes in hematological parameters before and after chemotherapy in breast cancer patients among the Sudanese population" is somewhat redundant, as the abstract already states the study's objective. Consider rephrasing or removing this sentence. 2. Unnecessary details: The mention of the automated hematology analyzer (Sysmex: XP-300) might be too specific for the abstract. Consider removing this detail or rephrasing it to focus on the methodology rather than the equipment used. | <p>Revision amended</p> <p>Correction made</p> |
| <p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p> | <p>Based on my review, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct in terms of its methodology, data analysis, and interpretation of results. Here are some specific aspects that support this assessment:</p> <p>Methodology</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Study design: The manuscript clearly describes the study design as a case-control study, which is appropriate for evaluating changes in hematological parameters pre- and post-chemotherapy. 2. Participant selection: The authors provide a clear description of the participant selection process, including the inclusion and exclusion criteria. 3. Data collection: The manuscript describes the data collection process, including the use of venous blood samples and automated hematology analyzer. <p>Data Analysis</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Statistical analysis: The authors used appropriate statistical tests (paired t-tests) to compare the changes in hematological parameters pre- and post-chemotherapy. 2. Data presentation: The results are clearly presented in tables and figures, making it easy to understand the changes in hematological parameters. <p>Results and Interpretation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Results: The manuscript presents the results of the study, including the significant reductions in RBC, WBC, and platelet counts post-chemotherapy. 2. Interpretation: The authors provide a clear interpretation of the results, discussing the implications of chemotherapy-induced hematological toxicity on breast cancer patients. <p>However, I do have some minor suggestions to further improve the scientific correctness of the manuscript:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide more details on the chemotherapy regimen: While the manuscript mentions chemotherapy, it would be helpful to provide more details on the specific regimen used, including the drugs, doses, and duration. | <p>Revised accordingly</p> <p>Noted</p> |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>2. Discuss potential confounding variables: The manuscript could benefit from a discussion on potential confounding variables that may have influenced the results, such as age, comorbidities, or concomitant medications.</p> <p>3. Consider adding a section on limitations: While the manuscript mentions some limitations, it would be helpful to have a dedicated section discussing the limitations of the study.</p> <p>Overall, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct, and with some minor revisions, it can be further strengthened.</p> | |
| <p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> | <p>The manuscript has a good number of references (14) that are relevant to the topic. However, I do have some suggestions for improvement:</p> <p>Sufficiency:</p> <p>1. Some sections, such as the discussion on chemotherapy-induced hematological toxicity, could benefit from additional references to support the authors' claims.</p> <p>Recency:</p> <p>1. While the manuscript has some recent references (2021, 2022), there are also some older references (2010, 2013, 2017) that may not reflect the current state of knowledge.</p> <p>2. Consider updating the references to include more recent studies (2023, 2024) that may have been published after the manuscript was written.</p> <p>Additional reference suggestions:</p> <p>1. National Comprehensive Cancer Network. (2022). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Breast Cancer. Version 2.2022.</p> <p>2. Schrijvers, D., & van Steenkiste, C. (2020). Hematological toxicity of chemotherapy. <i>Journal of Clinical Oncology</i>, 38(22), 2531-2538.</p> <p>3. Wang, Y., et al. (2022). Chemotherapy-induced hematological toxicity in breast cancer patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. <i>Journal of Hematology & Oncology</i>, 15(1), 1-12.</p> | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|---|---|--------------------|
| <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 good, but there are some areas that require improvement to make it suitable for scholarly communications. Here are some specific observations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clear structure and organization 2. Good use of technical vocabulary related to the field 3. Adequate grammar and sentence structure 4. Some sentences are wordy or awkwardly phrased, which can affect clarity. 5. There are instances of incorrect or inconsistent verb tense usage. 6. A few sentences lack precision or specificity, which can make them difficult to understand. 7. Some technical terms or abbreviations are not clearly defined or explained. | <p>Effectuated</p> |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>Minor Errors and Typos</p> <p>Please proofread the manuscript carefully to address any minor errors or typos, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inconsistent spacing or formatting - Missing or extra articles ("the", "a", etc.) - Minor punctuation errors - Typos in author names, journal titles, or references <p>Based on my review, I did not identify any major ethical issues in the manuscript. Based on my review, I did not identify any competing interest issues in the manuscript. I did not detect any plagiarism in the manuscript.</p> | <p>Ok</p> |

PART 2:

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>Reviewer's comment</p> | <p>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)</p> |
| <p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p> | <p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p> | |