

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_113861
Title of the Manuscript:	CERVICAL CANCER SCREENING IN THE METROPOLITAN REGION I, STATE OF PARÁ, AMAZON
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>This study addresses a very contemporary issue and would contribute to the existing body of knowledge on cervical cancer.</p> <p>The title is simple and appropriate.</p> <p>A sentence on recommendations would improve the abstract.</p> <p>The sections are clear and well-arranged, but the background section will be more comprehensive if a paragraph on review of existing literature is added.</p> <p>The manuscript is descriptive design which is relatively simple and straight to the point.</p> <p>The references are well written and adequate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">It would have been nice to present some descriptive information of the study population for example their sociodemographic characteristics; this would give the scientific community a better understanding of the population.There was no description of Figure 2 in the results section. A commentary on the figure will give more insight on the figure.Although there were variations in coverage between the different municipalities, this was not discussed. It will be more enlightening if the fine datils responsible for this discrepancy were discussed.The authors did not provide any recommendations from the study.	<p>Noted</p> <p>Done revision</p> <p>Noted and effected</p>
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript was written in a language that is clear and understandable</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

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)	