

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JAMMR_126524 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | EVALUATION OF QUALITY OF LIFE IN TREATED BREAST CANCER PATIENTS IN TERTIARY CARE HOSPITAL OF KARACHI |
| Type of the Article | |

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

| <u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i> |
|--|--|---|
| Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | <p>Studying the quality of life of patients is important work that needs to be commended. Healthcare systems need to consider this aspect of disease management more often, especially in middle-to-low-income countries.</p> <p>The FACT-B is a very good instrument but it not the only breast cancer instrument to measure QoL. The EORTC QLQ-BR23 or the BREAST-Q are not mentioned and the reason for not using them is not reported.</p> <p>The intention and results of the research are interesting and novel, unfortunately the manuscript needs editing because it is difficult to follow. Grammar and spelling need to be revised throughout.</p> | <p>Thank you for the kind comments.</p> <p>Study was conducted in order to assess factors having significant positive or negative effects on quality of life in the breast cancer survivors.</p> <p>FACT B score was used only rather than multiple questionnaires in order to maintain simplicity of study.</p> <p>This fact is mentioned in the revised manuscript in discussion section.</p> |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | Yes, the title suits the content | Appropriate changes have been made in the revised article. |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | <p>As with the whole manuscript, it is difficult to follow. Grammar needs to be revised throughout.</p> <p>Delete "Assessment of quality of life was done using FACT B questionnaire." from the results. That is a method.</p> | Thank you for the kind correction. Manuscript has been revised and due changes done along with grammar and spelling correction. |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | <p>Most subsections are appropriate. But I'd move Table 5 to supplementary data or index because it takes too much space and does not benefit reading.</p> <p>The limitations and strengths sections would be better to add them to the discussion unless it is required by the journal to be separate. Also, discuss them not just list them.</p> | <p>Limitations and strengths have been added to discussion section in revised manuscript as advised by the honourable reviewer. Necessary details regarding limitations and strength have been added too in revised manuscript.</p> <p>Table 5 is adjusted after result analysis.</p> |
| Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | <p>The study design is NOT prospective cross-sectional. As described in the manuscript, data was obtained once (cross-sectionally) after the treatment was completed. To be prospective, authors needed to collect data before and after treatment. Please remove 'prospective' to describe the study throughout which will also apply to one of the cited strengths.</p> <p>Grammar needs to be revised throughout. There are concerning typos like spelling GLOBOCAN and not GLOBOCAN or the names of the references are incorrect for example ref 22 is Mathias not Mathias. These errors reflect a lack of real awareness in the background and attention to detail. There are spelling errors throughout. The manuscript message needs to flow better and highlight the novelty of reporting data from a population that is not well reported (women from Pakistan).</p> <p>The introduction and discussion sections need work. In the intro, please remove the definition of quality of life. That is too basic to start an interesting presentation of the work I'm afraid. Please focus on the importance of the work, highlighting the reasons why you decided to study this. The first paragraph of the discussion should be in the intro.</p> <p>The year of surgery paragraph is out of place, it should be before the table 6.</p> <p>Since the authors did a sample size calculation, qualifying the size as a limitation is inadequate. That is a strength.</p> | <p>This study design is prospective in terms as only those patients were interviewed in current time who were presenting for follow up in breast clinic.</p> <p>All the grammar and spelling mistakes are corrected as advised in revised manuscript.</p> <p>Introduction and discussion sections are reviewed and necessary changes have been made in the revised manuscript as advised by the reviewer.</p> |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | The authors used very good references overall but they are missing a couple of key articles on quality of life of the relevant population such as: | <p>Thank you for the updated references.</p> <p>All the references in the articles have been reviewed and recent references</p> |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>=</p> | <p>Azam, M., Aslam, M., Basharat, J. <i>et al.</i> An empirical study on quality of life and related factors of Pakistani breast cancer survivors. <i>Sci Rep</i> 11, 24391 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-03696-9</p> <p>Mokhtari-Hessari P, Montazeri A. Health-related quality of life in breast cancer patients: review of reviews from 2008 to 2018. <i>Health Qual Life Outcomes</i>. 2020 Oct 12;18(1):338. doi: 10.1186/s12955-020-01591-x. Erratum in: <i>Health Qual Life Outcomes</i>. 2022 Feb 25;20(1):35. doi: 10.1186/s12955-022-01942-w.</p> <p>Also, the Ayub, 2023 article could be better used in the discussion in the context of results</p> <p>To cite data from GLOBOCAN, I'd recommend going directly to the source: https://gco.iarc.who.int/media/globocan/factsheets/cancers/20-breast-fact-sheet.pdf Data cited (2018) is not the latest reported (2022)</p> | <p>have been added in the revised manuscript. Few examples are mentioned below,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sun FK, Lu CY, Yao Y, Chiang CY. Social functioning, depression, and quality of life among breast cancer patients: A path analysis. <i>European Journal of Oncology Nursing</i>. 2023 Feb 1;62:102237. 2. https://gco.iarc.who.int/media/globocan/factsheets/cancers/20-breast-fact-sheet.pdf 3. Vohra LM, Javed SM, Jabeen D, Abidi SS, Tahseen MU. Quality of life of breast cancer survivors: a comparison of breast conserving surgery versus total mastectomy with and without immediate reconstruction: a prospective cohort study. <i>Annals of Medicine and Surgery</i>. 2023 May 1;85(5):1513-7. 4. Park HY, Nam KE, Lim JY, Yeo SM, Lee JI, Hwang JH. Real-time interactive digital health care system for postoperative breast cancer patients: a randomized controlled trial. <i>Telemedicine and e-Health</i>. 2023 Jul 1;29(7):1057-67. |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>The language is suitable but the manuscript needs grammar and spelling revision throughout.</p> | <p>All the necessary changes have been made.</p> |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>I commend the authors research but I'd recommend professional revision of the manuscript. I understand first hand that academic writing in a second language is challenging.</p> | <p>Thank you for the kind review of the article. Article has been reviewed and updated as required.</p> |

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) |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p> | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> | <p>No ethical issues noted.</p> |