

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	

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 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.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title ought to be clearer and more significant. EVALUATION OF QUALITY OF LIFE IN BREAST CANCER PATIENTS TREATED IN TERTIARY CARE HOSPITAL AT KARACHI.	
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.	
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.	
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.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Many grammar mistakes observed and few sentences needs modification	
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.	

Review Form 3

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pallivilla Umarani
Department, University & Country	Alluri Sitaramaraju Academy of Medical Sciences, India