

Review of: "A Cross-sectional Survey of Public and Private Cancer Care in Nigeria and Romania"

Yonas Gurmu

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

- The title didn't express clearly what the manuscript is about.
- This abstract has background.
 - Methods: Must clearly show how the participants were recruited, data were collected and the data were analyzed, while keeping alignment with the aims.
 - Conclusion must base on findings. You must conclude based on your findings.
- The Introduction section didn't address what it was supposed to address: it goes around. As a result, the section becomes unnecessarily broad. I would advise the authors to revise and re-formulate this section by tuning it towards the aim of their study. They should clearly describe: what is already known about the issues they planned to study, gaps, and how their study would fill the gaps. The authors need to review pertinent studies reporting on the issues under study. They should finally wind up the introduction by clearly stating their primary aim and research question/hypothesis.
- Why Ethical exemptions were granted in each hospital?
- The discussion lacks specificity: Under this section, the authors should be able to highlight the interpretation (meanings and/or implications) of their main findings in a succinct and pithy manner. In doing so, they may compare their findings with that of previous studies, in which they need to watch (the design, subjects, recruitment procedure, settings, type of analysis, etc.) the type of study they are choosing for comparison. It should be arranged/presented in a logical and evocative way.