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

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment**	**Author's Feedback***(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	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. 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. 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.	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	Yes, the title suits the content	
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.	As with the whole manuscript, it is difficult to follow. Grammar needs to be revised throughout. Delete "Assessment of quality of life was done using FACT B questionnaire." from the results. That is a method.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	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. 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.	
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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	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 thecited strengths. Grammar needs to be revised throughout. There are concerning typos like spelling GLOBOCON and not GLOBOCAN or the names of the references are incorrect for example ref 22 is Mathies 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). 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. The year of surgery paragraph is out of place, it should be before the table6. Sincethe authors did a sample size calculation, qualifying the size as a limitation is inadequate. That is a strength.	
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 therelevant population such as: Azam, M., Aslam, M., Basharat, J. *et al.* An empirical study on quality of life and related factors of Pakistani breast cancer survivors. *Sci Rep* 11, 24391 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-	

	03696-9 Mokhtari-Hessari P, Montazeri A. Health-related quality of life in breast cancer patients: review of reviews from 2008 to 2018. Health Qual Life Outcomes. 2020 Oct 12;18(1):338. doi: 10.1186/s12955-020-01591-x. Erratum in: Health Qual Life Outcomes. 2022 Feb 25;20(1):35. doi: 10.1186/s12955-022-01942-w. Also, the Ayub, 2023 article could be better used in the discussion in the context of results To cite data from GLOBOCAN, I'd recommend goingdirectly 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)	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The language is suitable but the manuscript needs grammar and spelling revision throughout.	
Optional/Generalcomments	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.	

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:	**Evelyn Gomez Espinosa**
Department, University & Country	**United Kingdom**