

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

## Ndoh Kingsley<sup>1</sup>

1 University of Washington

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

### The title is off!

- 1. First paragraph: does not really state why the research is done in the first place. What is the epidemiology of cancer in both countries? How many cancer centers exists? How many are public, private etc? Why was the research done in the first place and how will that help to ultimately improve patient outcomes
- 2. A study in Iran was cited, where there is a study in Nigeria published in the Journal of Cancer Policy that detailed all the major cancer center, the cancer funding landscape and the cost of care in Nigeria.
- 3. Another study in America was cited, when there are studies in Ukraine and Nigeria that tells a better story.
- 4. ??? migration of physicians to employment models???
- 5. Seeking health care through the internet is not a "new trend" Please refer to the Lancet Commission on Cancer in Sub-Saharan to see latest evidence on patient pathways.
- 6. Don't include links to websites in your intro like you did for ESMO, ASCO et al

Overall, the introduction does not really tell why this research is done in the first place. What do you hope to achieve with the results? it should be clear.

### Methodology:

There was no need to show any sample size calculations because it is not needed in this type of study. You are not studying any difference in any measure. This is a simple survey to understand patient experience.

Please revise methodology!

Ethical Consideration: The right terminology should be "Expedited Review" if it was actually reviewed or say something like since it was "minimal risk" we got an IRB review exemption.

# Questionnaire:

A patient is not expected to know if the hospital staff is receiving continuous education. The question is unrealistic.

I would suggest that authors should get a writer to re-write the paper before resubmitting. The overall writing is below par for a quality paper.

