

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Breast Cancer Awareness and Screening Perceptions of Women in Yerevan, Armenia

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: EMMANOUIL SMYRNAKIS

Submitted on: 17 Feb 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2024.1607029

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

Most women in this study were aware of breast cancer screening, about 50% knew someone with breast cancer, on the other hand a significant number had not undergone screening, predominantly without their physician's recommendation. The study highlights the role that healthcare providers may have in the future trying to answer the limitations that presented. Barriers included cost and mistreatment concerns are some more interesting findings in this study.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

It's a study that gave useful information for Armenian stakeholders in breast cancer screening. There are limitations well presented by authors. The most important is the response rate.

Q 3 Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

This is a well-written manuscript in a very interesting topic. All parts of the manuscript are well presented. Authors seem to have experience in the presentation of the methodology and results. Discussion covers the main findings taking into consideration current literature.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes, no change needed

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

I propose a minor change to the first keyword to Breast cancer screening awareness

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

English language has sufficient quality

Q 7 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

Q 8 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?)

Yes

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9 Originality

Q 10 Rigor

Q 11 Significance to the field

Q 12 Interest to a general audience

Q 13 Quality of the writing

Q 14 Overall scientific quality of the study

REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Accept.