

# Review of: "Is creeping abandonment of human cancer defences evolutionarily favoured?"

Arome Solomon Odiba<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Nigeria

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

The manuscript you provided has several flaws in reasoning, concept, and content. Additionally, the language is really poor. I have discussed the points under the various headings.

## Reasoning:

- **Limited Scope:** The hypothesis focuses solely on hunter-gatherer tribes and doesn't consider the entire evolutionary history of humans.
- **Oversimplification of Social Structure:** The assumption of strict male dominance and constant inter-tribe movement for females is likely inaccurate for all hunter-gatherer societies.
- **Selective Evidence:** The manuscript cherry-picks data on lifespan and social structure to fit the hypothesis.

## Concept:

- **Weak Antagonistic Pleiotropy Counterpoint:** The alternative hypothesis ("creeping abandon") doesn't effectively address the established role of antagonistic pleiotropy in explaining cancer risk after reproductive age.

## Content:

- **Outdated Anthropological References:** References to 20th-century hunter-gatherer societies may not accurately reflect the social structures of early humans.
- **Inaccurate Evolutionary Timescale:** The idea that most of human development occurred in small tribes ignores evidence of earlier hominid social structures.
- **Uncertain Epigenetic Effects:** The proposed epigenetic mechanism lacks scientific backing and needs further research.

## Here are some suggestions for improvement:

- Broaden the evolutionary perspective to include the entire human lineage.
- Consider alternative explanations for the high cancer risk in humans beyond social structure.
- Utilize more recent and comprehensive anthropological data on hunter-gatherer societies.
- Address the issue of antagonistic pleiotropy adequately.
- Provide more evidence for the proposed epigenetic mechanism.

**Overall, the manuscript presents an interesting idea but needs substantial revision and support with stronger evidence and a broader evolutionary framework.**