



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Oncology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJO_48935
Title of the Manuscript:	Breast Cancer Molecular Subtypes in Relation to Age, Stage and Grade among Sudanese Women Patients in Khartoum Oncology Hospital (2013 – 2017)
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>)

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>The paper is an important research because exploring your universe samples. I suggest extend the introduction, to write how impact submolecular classification of breast cancer in therapeutic decision and why is very important know them before treatment initiation. Talk about the therapeutic strategies in your Country, and the potential impact of your results in medical politics.</p> <p>The authors need to describe the techniques used to determined subtype molecular of the samples on the pathology area. Show us figures with the samples imagens. Describe with more details the clinical characteristics of the samples, all characteristics in the case files.</p> <p>The data tables need SD, same with the data in the text.</p> <p>The manuscript needs to review by a native English speaker.</p> <p>The manuscript has a lot typographic mistakes.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Review tables, data, grammar and orthography in general.	
Optional/General comments	I recognize the importance of this work and what is difficult to do, but the authors need to be more analytical and reorganize their results. The discussion must be stronger, with better content	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Martha E. Ruiz-tachiquin
Department, University & Country	Instituto Mexicano del Seguro Social, México