

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 25039

Title: Factors associated with cervical cancer screening in a safety net population

Reviewer's code: 00729478

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-02-22 17:46

Date reviewed: 2016-02-24 04:47

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

well written

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 25039

Title: Factors associated with cervical cancer screening in a safety net population

Reviewer's code: 00742250

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-02-22 17:46

Date reviewed: 2016-02-24 10:52

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

There were not any parts to be revised in the text.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 25039

Title: Factors associated with cervical cancer screening in a safety net population

Reviewer's code: 00504391

Reviewer's country: Mexico

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-02-22 17:46

Date reviewed: 2016-03-01 00:11

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Heberer et al. show data on some factors associated with cervical screening, especially considering health literacy. Their findings are interesting, and the work is complete and properly discussed. Only a few issues should be solved. Comments: 1. The title should be delimited to the main factor studied, namely, health literacy. 2. The authors should suggest some strategies to increase health literacy in the population. 3. Is the patient parents education a factor influencing the patient to undergo cervical cancer screening?

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 25039

Title: Factors associated with cervical cancer screening in a safety net population

Reviewer's code: 00742121

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-02-22 17:46

Date reviewed: 2016-03-01 15:02

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Though this is a quite well-written paper, it should not be accepted for publication by this journal. The authors may find the following comments useful for their future work. - In this study, Pap-smears were performed in women attending a breast clinic. However, breast cancer screening starts at age 40, while cervical screening should start at an earlier age, and the mean age of women in this study was 45. Hence, the most clinically relevant part of the population has been missed. - Besides Pap-smears, the current approach of cervical cancer screening includes HPV-DNA-testing. In fact, HPV-DNA-testing is increasingly replacing Pap-smears in cervical cancer screening programs. However, HPV-DNA-testing was not included in this study. - Primary prevention of cervical cancer includes preventive HPV-vaccination. Did any of the participants undergo HPV-vaccination?