

Review of: "Effect of Ethnic Differences on Breast Cancer Presentation and Prognosis in Singapore"

Sharon Cacala¹

¹ Tygerberg Hospital

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper.

Title: appropriate.

Keywords: appropriate.

Abstract: This needs to be put into the format of aim, methods, results, conclusion.

Introduction: Good. However, as throughout the entire paper, many references are written as (ref) and nothing is said about where they are from. Also put in as (name et al) without a reference number.

References need to be put into the text in a standard numbered manner and into the References at the end of the paper as numbers, not bullet points.

In the introduction, "3" should be written as 3.

There are italics in one sentence. This sentence is difficult to understand.

Methods: This is rather confusing as to which times were included for each study reviewed. Were some numbers duplicated if in the same time periods?

SGH is not written in full before it is abbreviated, and only in the discussion does it become clear that it is Singapore General Hospital, but there it is not abbreviated.

What papers were actually also reviewed? What was obtained from them?

The methods could be improved for better understanding; what was reviewed and in what time frames. Moreover, what was looked at.

Results: The results need to be referenced to which tables and figures to look at; that is, to direct from the text to what is elaborated on in which table/figure.

Nowhere in the results section are p-values included. All are just comparisons without any significance stated. This would be better justified with stats.

Discussion: Very interesting but should be compared to your findings in results to make it appropriate for this review.

Would be better to tie up your findings with the literature you have reviewed.

Dietary patterns need a reference. Tie into your findings.

Genetics needs a reference for "according to previous genetic research." With the BRCA numbers from the literature, can this be compared with your study data, not mentioned in the results. Maybe this was looked at in the TNBC from SGH.

Conclusion: This is rather lengthy and might be written in a more concise fashion. Figures should not be referenced in a conclusion.

References: This section needs to be put in a standard referencing manner, and all the (ref) written in your text, as well as "names," need to be put in the text correctly as numbers. All the papers/studies/manuals you used in your methods need to be referenced.

Overall: your message gets across, but the paper could be improved as suggested above.