



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Cancer and Tumor International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JCTI_48129
Title of the Manuscript:	Low Total White Blood Cell Count and High HDL- cholesterol in breast cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy at Cape Coast Teaching Hospital; A longitudinal single center study.
Type of the Article	Original article: observational study

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>Abstract Should include the drugs/regimen used The abstract method section has details not represented in the main method of the article In the conclusion of the abstract, it is better to state the effect rather than say adverse effect</p> <p>Introduction The bulk of the introduction seems generic for breast cancer and not related to the topic The topic was not introduced nor discussed until the last and final paragraph. The introduction needs to be reviewed to reflect the literature in the area of the topic and show where this research article extends the discussion about the topic</p> <p>Method The method section is too fragmented The patients studied and the circumstance was not adequately typified. Should include information on the chemotherapy regimen used by the patients and information on when the blood was collected What was the instance of the chemotherapy-indication eg neoadjuvant ? What was the stage of the diseases studied? State specifically when were the parameters studied? The statistical method proposed in the method section is confusing, reconcile the continuous and bivariate variable statement</p> <p>Results The social variables are overly represented here and their importance in this research topic is doubtful The tables are excessive and difficult , the changes in the parameters studies should be presented in trend graphs for easy understanding In the histologic type, NST and NOS are the same histologic type of cancer of the breast, the authors need to go with one It is perhaps better to describe changes in lipid profile in relation to weight rather than in relation to histologic type of tumor The authors confuse advanced tumor, NST and NOS as different classes or pathologic types of breast cancer. This needs to be reviewed.</p> <p>Discussion It is not clear what the authors imply by the fluctuation in the blood pressure and the blood cells with the cycles of chemotherapy There is sweeping generalization and stretching of the result beyond what can be gotten from the design of this study The studies brought into the discussion were mostly different in context from this study</p> <p>Conclusion The conclusion goes beyond what can be derived directly from the study</p> <p>References : atypical citing method present Generally: grammar and presentation of information issues need to be improved</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	The relevance and the previous literature not clear hence one cannot place this research. The relevance will help consumers to understand the information and perhaps consider its utility and to extend the discussion	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	Information about chemotherapy is important in developing countries because the majority of patient require chemotherapy as neoadjuvant, adjuvant and even salvage therapy. Notwithstanding, it is important for the information gathered to be useful in terms of detailed description of who has what, what drugs are related to what effects and how the manuscript may impacts decision making for clinicians	
----------------------------------	---	--

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>	

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:	Agodirin S. Olayide
Department, University & Country	University of Ilorin, Nigeria