

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Cancer and Tumor International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JCTI_87519
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevention of adjuvant treatment induced cardiotoxicity in Egyptian breast cancer patients: a randomized prospective study
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)

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	The article is a great one showing good results in an important era that make medical oncologists changing a lot of protocols due to cardiac toxicity but I noted : 1.Small sample of patients although the rate of breast cancer is so high worldwide so we can obtain a large sample of patients. 2. the study done between 2015-2016 so too long time passed with follow up only for one year so why the delay? 3. was the study contain the protocol of trastuzumab /pergitta or not and if yes , is there a difference in cardiotoxicity or not significant?	1- In our department the study sample size is to be decided by the statistics department, taking into consideration the lack of research team and assistants that follow the patients and the difficult communication with the patients in the follow up period that is usually individualized and usually directed to organizing issues as chemotherapy drugs are not available in many times 2- Difficulty in contacting the patients and financial burden of contacting them in view of lack of fund and dedicated research assisting team in addition CMR is very expensive and usually not approved as an assessment tool for follow up 3- Pertuzumab was not available in our guidelines then,
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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)	