

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

Keneuoe C Nthontho¹

¹ University of Botswana

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Title

The title is not clear and should not be open to multiple interpretations, in particular, the "CREEPING ABANDON" part is a little misleading to some readers and scary.

Abstract

The abstract matches well with the main text, however, "Peto's paradox" should be explained. In addition, "homo sapiens" should be spelled *Homo sapiens*. Generally, the abstract is too close to the main text, almost "copy n paste".

Context

Again, "Peto's paradox" should be explained as well as the "antagonistic pleiotropy".

And, in general, the comparison with apes is not clear.

Setting of the hypothesis

The section on hunter-gatherers is not referenced and it's mostly a weird speculation. For example, it is well known that the Khoisan from Southern Africa hunt in (small) groups, contrary to what the authors assume. Hypothesis without evidences/references are not valid scientifically, so all the assumptions about hunter-gatherers, the mega fauna and the sexual selection should be proved by strong evidences. if they are there, they should be referenced.

The hypothesis

The hypothesis is not clear, in part because of the "creeping abandon" statement tha should be changed to more proper English throughout the text, in part because of clear evidences that for example breast cancer in younger women is very aggressive as opposed to older women. Finally, how can this hypothesis facilitate cancer prevention?

Suggested experiments

I partially agree with the first two possible approaches. However, the third seems to be conditioned to so many factors that I doubt that this can prove their "creeping abandon" theory.

In summary, this paper is somehow novel and could be even more interesting with more appropriate explanations,

references and English.