



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_48694
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance Status Evaluation in a Tertiary Center in Southern Nigeria
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>Methods – It would be interesting to provide the questionnaire that was used or a reference to the questionnaire.</p> <p>Methods – It's not clear to me what are registrars. Are they the medical residents? It would be helpful to clarify who are consultants, registrars and senior registrars in the institution, since this may vary in different countries. I understood there is no Medical Oncology specialty in the Hospital. I think it is also important to highlight this.</p> <p>Results – Authors report a return rate of 70%. Among the questionnaires that were returned, how many or properly filled and were included in the research?</p> <p>Results – Line 86 and Figure 2 – The text and figure suggest that each respondent only new one PS test. Weren't there respondents who knew both ECOG and KPS, for example? This should be also illustrated in Figure 2.</p> <p>Table 1, 2 and 3 – A p-value is presented, but there is no mention of any statistical test in the methods section. The statistical test used should be detailed in the methods section.</p> <p>Discussion – Lines 120 – 121 – When there is no active oncologic treatment adequate for a patient, he usually benefits from best supportive care (BSC). BSC does not mean “leaving the patient”. This phrase should be rewritten.</p> <p>Discussion – Line 150 – In table 2, it appears that the right number would be 57.4% in place of 50.7%.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Abstract – Results: What were the specialties of the doctors who responded the questionnaires?</p> <p>Abstract – Lines 21 – 24 do not present results. This information should be placed in the Conclusion.</p> <p>Results – Line 81 – I believe authors mean “were” in place of “where”.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>Discussion – Lines 131 – 134: Besides depression, palliative chemotherapy for patients with poor performance status is associated with a high frequency of toxicities, complications, and a decrease in quality of life. Frequently, the harms overweight potential benefits in this scenario. Authors could further discuss these points.</p>	



SDI 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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Renata R. C. Colombo Bonadio</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Instituto do Cancer do Estado de Sao Paulo, Brazil</i>