



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

Manuscript NO: 41953

Title: Hong Kong Female’s Breast Cancer Awareness Measure (Breast-CAM):
Cross-sectional survey

Reviewer’s code: 00742121

Reviewer’s country: Greece

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-09-04

Date reviewed: 2018-09-22

Review time: 18 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> General
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting paper regarding breast cancer awareness in Hong Kong. Although it seems that the study was properly conducted, the authors have failed to present, analyse and discuss their results adequately and draw firm conclusions. Hence, this



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

paper could only be accepted for publication after major revision, according to the following comments: Abstract, Methods: The total number and age distribution of participants should be provided (see further comments below). Abstract, Methods: The number of participants in (a) clinically relevant age subgroups or preferably (b) clinically relevant decades should be provided; (a) e.g. “very young women” (i.e. <30 years old) or “young women” (< 40 years old) or “premenopausal vs. postmenopausal women” (<50 vs. >50 years old); (b) women <30 years old, 30-40 years old, 40-50 years old, 50-60 years old, 60-70 years old and >70 years old. Abstract, Results, line 60: “majority” should be replaced by a precise number. Abstract, Results: Results should be provided in a consistent manner (e.g. percentage of women) in different age groups and possibly the total number of participants (not just in the whole sample). Abstract, Results, line 67 and 68: The chi-square test results should be omitted; only the p-values should be provided. Abstract, Conclusion: This subsection is very vague. Concrete conclusions should be provided. Abstract, Conclusion, line 80: The authors use vaguely the verb “differ”; how do the age groups differ from one another; in what terms do they differ? Abstract, Conclusion, line 81: As mentioned earlier, the dichotomous division in women younger and older than 60 years of age is not clinically relevant and it should be changed accordingly. Main text, Introduction, line 107: The authors mention vaguely some “lifestyle factors”; they should be more precise (which lifestyle factors?). Main text, Materials and Methods: This section is well written. Main text, Materials and Methods, lines 222-223: The authors should explain the rationale for dividing participants into two groups of women, younger and older than 60 years of age. Main text, Results, lines 227-228: The authors state that “A total of 16,903 telephone numbers were sampled and among these 15,172 were invalid numbers”. This is really confusing and it should be explained in this section and discussed in the Discussion section (probably together with other weaknesses of the study). Main text, Results: As already mentioned Results should



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

be provided in a consistent manner (e.g. percentage of women) in different age groups and possibly the total number of participants. Please revise extensively. Main text, Results, line 330 and lines 350-352: Breast self-examination is no longer clinically relevant; given that it leads to over-diagnosis (especially in younger age groups), it has been abandoned in most countries, and it has been replaced by “breast awareness”, i.e. the main outcome of the questionnaire used in this study. Hence, it was really unfortunate that the authors modified the UK tool, by adding questions regarding breast self-examination; please revise accordingly. Main text, Discussion: In the first seven paragraphs of this section, the results of this study have been merely repeated, with virtually no discussion in relation to the findings of previous studies; only in the 5th paragraph, the authors do really discuss their findings regarding breast cancer and age with the increasing incidence of breast cancer with increasing age, according to previous studies (references 26-30). Please revise extensively. Main text, Discussion, lines 458-465: The subsection entitled “Comparison to UK Breast-CAM” should be omitted and its content should be discussed in association with the findings of the present study (see previous comment). Main text, Discussion, line 470: The authors mention some “other population-based surveys”; they should be more precise (which surveys?). Main text, Conclusion: As with the relevant subsection of the Abstract, this section is very vague and firm conclusions should be provided. Tables: The tables should be revised according to the previous comments; a new statistical analysis in clinically relevant age groups is needed, and subsequent findings should be provided in the tables. Table 3 seems already very complex for the average reader and it should be probably divided in two other tables. Finally, some Figures should be provided showing diagrammatically the main findings of this study

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT



Baishideng Publishing Group

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

Manuscript NO: 41953

Title: Hong Kong Female’s Breast Cancer Awareness Measure (Breast-CAM):
Cross-sectional survey

Reviewer’s code: 03259512

Reviewer’s country: Australia

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-09-18

Date reviewed: 2018-09-25

Review time: 7 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors conducted a population-based survey using random telephone interviews to women aged 18 and above using the UK Cancer Research Breast Cancer Awareness Measure (UK CAM). The study was properly designed and comprehensive. It is well



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

written and illustrated. There are few minor points to address. 1. Minor English editing is required. For instance, line 209 “..the survey questions was rearranged” should be corrected to “..the survey questions were rearranged...”. 2. Some words are missing, for instance: Line 494: “... year-old were better...” should be “ ... year-old women were better...” 3. Line 436: “..median age of breast cancer patients was 51.0 in Hong Kong...”. This data was not properly discussed and no suggestion was indicated why that actually observed. It looks like younger women are more informed and aware of the breast cancer screening. However, how much younger? Maybe the age group from 18 till 45, but the 45-55 is not than well informed. That possibility should be tested specifically/ or addressed in the discussion section in more details. 4. Considering that the median age of HongKong women is 51 for breast cancer, I suggest to add another column in the table #2 and compare those in the age group 45-55 with those who is older than 60 and younger than 45. Or at least suggest that this group (45-55yo) of women should be specifically aimed in the future studies.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

[Y] No



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

Manuscript NO: 41953

Title: Hong Kong Female’s Breast Cancer Awareness Measure (Breast-CAM):
Cross-sectional survey

Reviewer’s code: 00468686

Reviewer’s country: Turkey

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-09-18

Date reviewed: 2018-09-25

Review time: 7 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors evaluated Hong Kong women’s awareness about breast cancer, attitude, knowledge and screening practice of breast examinations. They found that 4 in 10 women did nothing to prevent breast cancer. The majority of women did not aware how



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

age relate to breast cancer, and 63% of respondents reported that they were not confident that they would notice a change in their breasts. The manuscript is well written and organised. There are only some minor typos to be corrected.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No