

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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.	This paper discusses a topic of oncology relevance: the quality of life in breast cancer patients. Understanding the impact on patients' lives and emotions is crucial, as breast cancer remains the most prevalent disease among women. However, there was no mention of the study's limitations. It is noteworthy that the Fact B scoring system has been used to evaluate the improvement in quality of life among breast cancer patients who have survived the disease.	Thank you for the kind comments. Study was conducted in order to assess factors having significant positive or negative effects on quality of life in the breast cancer survivors.  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. In previous manuscript strengths and limitations were mentioned in points. In revised manuscript it has been added as paragraph in discussion section.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title ought to be clearer and more significant. <b>EVALUATION OF QUALITY OF LIFE IN BREAST CANCER PATIENTS TREATED IN TERTIARY CARE HOSPITAL AT KARACHI.</b>	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.	Along with a statement on the significance of the Fact B scoring system in the Introduction section, the materials and methods should have contained a thorough description of how the Fact B questionnaire is used to evaluate quality of life.	FACT B utilization has been explained in the material and method section.  FACT B is the breast cancer specific instrument derived from the FACIT system for evaluation of quality of life (10). It contains 37 items divided into 5 subscales with each item rated on a five point likert scale from 0-4. The five subscales include physical, social, emotional, functional wellbeing along with additional concerns for breast cancer. Total score is calculated by adding the score of each scale which in turn is achieved by sum up of score of each question (total score ranging from 0-148). The higher the score, higher is the quality of life of patient (21). Verbal and written informed consent was taken and confidentiality was preserved. Data was recorded by the principal investigator on a predesigned Performa and by using FACT B questionnaire after getting license for using FACT B in both English and Urdu languages. Questions were explained to the patients who were unable to read and answers were selected as the participant choice.
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, The IMRAD structure was followed .	
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.	This work has excellent clinical backing and is technically sound. Eighty patients participated in the one-year patient follow-up, and the questionnaire includes detailed information on the quality of life of those affected by breast cancer. Similar comparative research ought to have been included in the discussion section in tabular format.	Comparative details of patients have been explained in tabular format in result section so not repeated tables in discussion section. All the comparison in relation to FACT B subscales and comparison in relation to social and clinical factors have been explained both in paragraphs as well as in tabular format in result section. Further comparative assessment is also done in discussion section.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The articles are poorly arranged, and the older ones ought to be replaced by at least five more recent ones. They ought to be placed from most current to oldest articles. The article needs to be properly updated and renumbered.	Thank you for the updated references.  All the references in the articles have been reviewed and recent references have been added in the revised manuscript as well as all references have been rearranged in revised manuscript as advised by the honourable reviewer.

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Many grammar mistakes observed and few sentences needs modification	All the grammar and spelling mistakes are corrected as advised in revised manuscript.
Optional/General comments	A bigger sample size is necessary for the paper, which tackles a crucial component of breast cancer patients' quality of life, to significantly impact the scientific community. Furthermore, it may have been raised to a higher level if the study had taken into account the patients' histological variations of duct carcinomas.	<p>Sample size was calculated by the software.</p> <p>By using previously available literature (11) reporting mean +- standard deviation of FACT B total score of 107.69 +/- 0.22 using margin of error (d) 5%, the total calculated sample size is 80 patients undergoing assessment for quality of life using FACT B scoring scale with the help of WHO software for sample size calculation using 95% confidence interval.</p> <p>Histological variations was noted at the time of data collection but not mentioned in the study as no significant relation of histology with quality of life was noted as per results analysis. And further to keep simplicity of the article.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	No ethical issues noted.