



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_50272
Title of the Manuscript:	Why don't Cancer survivors attend cancer support groups in Toronto
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>What was the fraction of patients with Chinese background to participate in support groups similar to patients with other ethical backgrounds? Is this ratio the same as for other diseases? What about the usefulness of these activities given that only a low fraction of patients participates in these groups. The role of practioners to promote a positive view on the groups has not been mentioned. Were patients also questioned about the type of group they had attended (open/closed) and about the number of participants. What alternative platforms could be offered to the patients?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The authors studied the reasons for not attending cancer support groups in a small collective of Chinese patients. They identified four major reasons and the option to name more than one reason was available. They proposed better patient match to support group and more language-friendly groups for improvement.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Eleonore Fröhlich
Department, University & Country	Medical University of Graz, Austria