

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Cancer and Tumor International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JCTI_115384
Title of the Manuscript:	The Role of Magnetic Resonance Imaging in Early Detection of Cancer: Present and Prospective Challenges for Future Research
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journaljcti.com/index.php/JCTI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes Yes Yes No. Aims and Objectives seem contradicting when used at the same time as titles Yes Yes	Thanks for the commendations and comments.
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	-The Conclusion is not in line with the objectives. -The challenges should be stated and explained only briefly -The objectives should be precise and clear	The aim and objectives have been adjusted to be in line with the Conclusion. Being a technical review paper, the challenges was made to be comprehensive for clarity purpose. The objectives are precise and clear.

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)	