

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

Katsuhito Kino<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Tokushima Bunri University

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

It would be very interesting for the reader to explore why humans have a higher cancer's risk compared to all observed other species. However, I think that the manuscript written here needs to be substantially changed.

1) First of all, the type of this paper is "suggestion" and is not a so-called "Regular article". Since Qeios does not have an article type classification, I think you should add "Suggestion:", "Commentary:", or "Opinion:" at the beginning of the title.

2) Overall, one paragraph is too long, and I think the abstract could be revised to be shorter and more concise. "1. Context" and "2. Setting of the hypothesis" should be split into two or more paragraphs.

3) It is related to 2). I think it includes too many things. In particular, in "2. Setting of the hypothesis," I think the authors should verify once again whether the text is really necessary to formulate the authors' hypothesis.

4) There are many supplementary sentences using ( ). You should modify your logical structure to not use them at all in your paper. Only word is allowed to use ( ).

Below is a detailed suggested modification.

In "1. Context",

5) What is the basis for the sentence "Obviously many cases of human cancer are due to carcinogens which we eat, breathe and receive in other ways through our modern lifestyle, which were not available to prehistoric humans, nor are they to observed animals"? Please provide some references. If this basis is ambiguous, it will be difficult to maintain the validity of the logic to the next sentence.

6) What are "species-specific cancer defenses [6]"? Is this the same as "species-specific tumour suppression mechanisms [9,10]"? Additional details should be added.

If such an example is the sentence starting with "Chimpanzees," then the beginning of this sentence should be "For example, chimpanzees,".

7) The mathematical model(s) should be described in your manuscript to make it easier for the reader to understand.

8) In order to clarify the different hypotheses of the authors, "antagonistic pleiotropy" should be explained in more detail.

In "2. Setting of the hypothesis",

9) Is the sentence "those modern tribes were marginalized into territories unsuitable for agriculture and pastoralism, and little animals were available for them to hunt, while" necessary in the authors' logical development?

10) The "cave paintings" should have any citations.

11) There is no basis on which the hypothesis "and women would have had the opportunity to move to a different tribe once reaching adulthood." could be derived. Besides, is this sentence necessary?

12) The authors are assuming that women moves to different tribe(s), but there is a possibility that men also move to a different tribe(s). When this possibility is considered, I think the following logical development will fail. Authors need evidence that men do not move to different tribe(s). Of course, citation(s) are required.

13) The logical development from the sentences after 12) to "3. The hypothesis" also seems unreasonable. Therefore, "2. Setting of the hypothesis" needs to be clarified and reconstructed with the minimum necessary logical development. When authors do so, the cited references would strongly support the authors' logical development.

In "3. The hypothesis",

14) The authors described that "we would expect human cancer defences to reduce their activity with advancing age.". Isn't this already obvious? For example, mutations of cancer suppressor genes with age.

15) The second paragraph all seems unreasonable.

In "4. Suggested experiments",

16) "4. Suggested experiments" needs to be changed in its entirety due to the change in "3. the hypothesis".