

Socio-demographic factors and clinical presentation of women attending Cancer Detection Centre, Kolkata for breast examination

Sinjini Sarkar, Dipanwita Ghosh, Sutapa Mahata, Pranab Kumar Sahoo, Asoke Roy, Manisha Vernekar, Karabi Datta, Syamsundar Mandal, Vilas D. Nasare

Corresponding author:

Dr. Vilas D. Nasare

*Department of Pathology and Cancer Screening, Chittaranjan National Cancer Institute,
Kolkata*

Handeling editor:

Michal Heger

Department of Pharmaceutics, Utrecht University, the Netherlands

Department of Pharmaceutics, Jiaxing University Medical College, Zhejiang, China

Review timeline:

Received: 14 November, 2019

Editorial decision: 7 December, 2019

Revision received: 11 December, 2019

Editorial decision, 6 January, 2020

Revision received: 23 January, 2020

Editorial decision: 23 January, 2020

Published online: 19 March, 2020

1st Editorial decision

7-Dec-2019

Ref.: Ms. No. JCTRes-D-19-00027

Socio-demographic factors and clinical presentation of women attending Cancer Detection
Centre, Kolkata from 1995-2016

Journal of Clinical and Translational Research

Dear Dr. Nasare,

Reviewers have now commented on your paper. You will see that they are advising that you revise your manuscript. If you are prepared to undertake the work required, I would be pleased to reconsider my decision.

For your guidance, reviewers' comments are appended below. I kindly ask you to pay particular attention to reviewer 1, who has raised several critical issues. The editorial board kindly requests that you adequately address all these issues.

One of the issues pertains to the use of English language. Please ensure that the resubmission is in pristine English. Contact the editor-in-chief if you require help with the writing.

If you decide to revise the work, please submit a list of changes or a rebuttal against each point which is being raised when you submit the revised manuscript. Also, please ensure that the track changes function is switched on when implementing the revisions. This enables the reviewers to rapidly verify all changes made.

Your revision is due by Jan 06, 2020.

To submit a revision, go to <https://www.editorialmanager.com/jctres/> and log in as an Author. You will see a menu item call Submission Needing Revision. You will find your submission record there.

Yours sincerely

Michal Heger
Editor-in-Chief
Journal of Clinical and Translational Research

Reviewers' comments:

Reviewer #1: The authors explored the relation between a bunch of risk factors and detection of cancer, based on a retrospective data of 1180 women.

The biggest issue of this article is the results section.

First, 3.1 is Description of the population, it should be just the description of the cohort, so analysis results shouldn't be described here.

Second, how many of the patients had the outcome (detection of cancer) is only introduced in 3.3. Without showing this number in the beginning of results and without the cross-tabs in table 1 and table 2, the reader can not assess the association reported there.

So, the reviewer suggest to rewrite the results section with the following structure:

3.1 Description of the cohort

Only describe the distributions of all the risk factors and outcome.

3.2 Association between socio-demographic characteristics and detection of cancer

3.3 Association between gynaecological and obstetric history and detection of cancer

And, make the table 1 only contain descriptive statistics (no p-value)

Make new table 2, show the cross table of risk factors and the outcome, and the corresponding p-values.

Some minor issues:

1. significant level was set at 0.05, should the authors consider about adjusting for multiple testing when evaluating so many risk factors?
2. figure 2 seems not very relevant in this epidemiological research.

Reviewer #2: The tables bearing the P values, and significance, author may clearly mention the P value taken is 0.005 or 0.001 or 0.0001 ?, may re-look in to the data and correct if necessary.

Author's rebuttal

Manuscript ID: Ms. No. JCTRes-D-19-00027

Manuscript title: "Socio-demographic factors and clinical presentation of women attending Cancer Detection Centre, Kolkata for breast examination"

Authors: Sinjini Sarkar et al.

Dear Dr. Michal Heger,

Thank you for your letter dated Sat, Dec 7, 2019. We were pleased to know that, our manuscript was rated as potentially acceptable for publication in the Journal of Clinical and Translational Research, subject to adequate revision and response to the comments raised by the reviewers.

Based on the instructions provided in your letter, we uploaded the file of the revised manuscript and comments also.

As you notice, we have revised the manuscript by correcting the English language and modifying the Results and Tables, based on the comments made by the reviewers.

As you notice, we agreed with all the comments raised by the reviewers. We would like to take this opportunity to express our sincere thanks to the reviewers who identified areas of our manuscript that needed corrections or modification. We would like also to thank you for allowing us to resubmit a revised copy of the manuscript.

I hope that the revised manuscript is accepted for publication in the Journal of Clinical and Translational Research.

. Sincerely Yours,

COMMENTS TO THE AUTHOR:

Reviewer #1: The authors explored the relation between a bunch of risk factors and detection of cancer, based on a retrospective data of 1180 women.

The biggest issue of this article is the results section.

First, 3.1 is Description of the population, it should be just the description of the cohort, so analysis results shouldn't be described here.

Second, how many of the patients had the outcome (detection of cancer) is only introduced in 3.3. Without showing this number in the beginning of results and without the cross-tabs in table 1 and table 2, the reader can not assess the association reported there.

So, the reviewer suggest to rewrite the results section with the following structure:

3.1 Description of the cohort

Only describe the distributions of all the risk factors and outcome.

3.2 Association between socio-demographic characteristics and detection of cancer

3.3 Association between gynaecological and obstetric history and detection of cancer

And, make the table 1 only contain descriptive statistics (no p-value)

Make new table 2, show the cross table of risk factors and the outcome, and the corresponding p-values.

Some minor issues:

1. significant level was set at 0.05, should the authors consider about adjusting for multiple testing when evaluating so many risk factors?

2. figure 2 seems not very relevant in this epidemiological research.

Reviewer #2: The tables bearing the P values, and significance, author may clearly mention the P value taken is 0.005 or 0.001 or 0.0001 ?, may re-look in to the data and correct if necessary.

We are extremely grateful to the Reviewer for the encouraging comments/suggestions, we agree with their suggestions/comments and have included all the corrections which are highlighted in red colour and the English corrections are underlined in the revised manuscript.

Reviewer #1: The authors explored the relation between a bunch of risk factors and detection of cancer, based on a retrospective data of 1180 women. The biggest issue of this article is the results section.

First, 3.1 is Description of the population, it should be just the description of the cohort, so analysis results shouldn't be described here.

Second, how many of the patients had the outcome (detection of cancer) is only introduced in 3.3. Without showing this number in the beginning of results and without the corss-tabs in table 1 and table 2, the reader can not assess the association reported there.

So, the reviewer suggest to rewrite the results section with the following structure:

3.1 Description of the cohort

Only describe the distributions of all the risk factors and outcome.

3.2 Association between socio-demographic characteristics and detection of cancer

3.3 Association between gynaecological and obstetric history and detection of cancer

And, make the table 1 only contain descriptive statistics (no p-value)

Make new table 2, show the cross table of risk factors and the outcome, and the corresponding p-values.

Some minor issues:

1. significant level was set at 0.05, should the authors consider about adjusting for multiple testing when evaluating so many risk factors?

2. figure 2 seems not very relevant in this epidemiological research.

Comment 1: First, 3.1 is Description of the population, it should be just the description of the cohort, so analysis results shouldn't be described here.

Second, how many of the patients had the outcome (detection of cancer) is only introduced in 3.3. Without showing this number in the beginning of results and without the corss-tabs in

table 1 and table 2, the reader can not assess the association reported there.

Answer: The subheading of 3.1 has been changed to *Description of cohort*. Secondly the number of patients detected with cancer has been mentioned in the second line of 3.1.

Comment 2: the reviewer suggest to rewrite the results section with the following structure:

3.1 Description of the cohort

Only describe the distributions of all the risk factors and outcome.

3.2 Association between socio-demographic characteristics and detection of cancer

3.3 Association between gynaecological and obstetric history and detection of cancer

Answer: The results section is rewritten in the suggested structure as,

3.1 Description of the cohort

3.2 Association between socio-demographic characteristics and detection of cancer

3.3 Association between gynaecological and obstetric history and detection of cancer

The distributions of all the risk factors and outcome are compiled in 3.1 without cross tab analysis and p-value (Pages 5, 6 &7).

Comment 3: make the table 1 only contain descriptive statistics (no p-value)

Make new table 2, show the cross table of risk factors and the outcome, and the corresponding p-values.

Answer: Table 1 is revised with only frequencies and percentages of characteristics assessed for the study participants without p value.

Table 2 has been created with only risk factors associated with detection of cancer. The significant (bold) as well as not significant results are shown with their corresponding p-values. The p-value is taken ≤ 0.05 , which is mentioned in the table itself.

Comment 4: Some minor issues:

1. significant level was set at 0.05, should the authors consider about adjusting for multiple testing when evaluating so many risk factors?

2. figure 2 seems not very relevant in this epidemiological research.

Answer: 1. We have taken significance level at 0.05 with 95% confidence interval considering all risk factors.

2. The figure is showing an FNAC slide of breast cancer. These slides are archival and taken from the hospital and the sample is of one of the participants included in the study. We request to keep this figure in this paper.

Reviewer #2: The tables bearing the P values, and significance, author may clearly mention the P value taken is 0.005 or 0.001 or 0.0001 ?, may re-look in to the data and correct if necessary.

Comment 1: The tables bearing the P values, and significance, author may clearly mention the P value taken is 0.005 or 0.001 or 0.0001 ?, may re-look in to the data and correct if necessary.

Answer: Significance level was set at 0.05 and confidence intervals were at 95 percent level. $p \leq 0.05$ was considered to be statistically significant. This has been mentioned in subheading 2.3 *Statistical analysis* and also in Table 2. In the results section the exact p values of the significant risk factors are mentioned in the text.

2nd Editorial decision

06-Jan-2020

Ref.: Ms. No. JCTRes-D-19-00027R1

Socio-demographic factors and clinical presentation of women attending Cancer Detection Centre, Kolkata for breast examination
Journal of Clinical and Translational Research

Dear author(s),

Reviewers have submitted their critical appraisal of your paper. The reviewers' comments are appended below. Based on their comments and evaluation by the editorial board, your work was FOUND SUITABLE FOR PUBLICATION AFTER MINOR REVISION. Please follow the reviewer's instructions as specified.

If you decide to revise the work, please itemize the reviewers' comments and provide a point-by-point response to every comment. An exemplary rebuttal letter can be found on at <http://www.jctres.com/en/author-guidelines/> under "Manuscript preparation." Also, please use the track changes function in the original document so that the reviewers can easily verify your responses.

Your revision is due by Feb 05, 2020.

To submit a revision, go to <https://www.editorialmanager.com/jctres/> and log in as an Author. You will see a menu item call Submission Needing Revision. You will find your submission record there.

Yours sincerely,

Michal Heger
Editor-in-Chief
Journal of Clinical and Translational Research

Reviewers' comments:

Reviewer #1: The revision version was much improved.

However, there are still some issues left.

In table 2, only p-values were presented. The reviewer strongly suggested to add the cross-tab of outcome by risk factors, in addition to the p-value.

The authors may consider to report their research following the items listed in the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) Statement. <https://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/strobe/>

Author's rebuttal

Manuscript ID: Ms. No. JCTRes-D-19-00027R1

Manuscript title: "Socio-demographic factors and clinical presentation of women attending Cancer Detection Centre, Kolkata for breast examination"

Authors: Sinjini Sarkar et al.

Dear Dr. Michal Heger,

Thank you for your letter dated Tue, Jan 7, 2020. We were pleased to know that, our manuscript was rated as potentially acceptable with minor revision for publication in the Journal of Clinical and Translational Research, subject to adequate revision and response to the comments raised by the reviewers.

Based on the instructions provided in your letter, we uploaded the file of the re-revised manuscript and comments also.

As you notice, we have re-revised the manuscript by upgrading the Tables, based on the comments made by the reviewer.

As you notice, we agreed with all the comments raised by the reviewers. We would like to take this opportunity to express our sincere thanks to the reviewers who identified areas of our manuscript that needed corrections or modification. We would like also to thank you for allowing us to resubmit a re-revised copy of the manuscript.

I hope that the re-revised manuscript is accepted for publication in the Journal of Clinical and Translational Research.

. Sincerely Yours,

COMMENTS TO THE AUTHOR:

Reviewer #1: The revision version was much improved. However, there are still some issues left. In table 2, only p-values were presented. The reviewer strongly suggested to add the cross-tab of outcome by risk factors, in addition to the p-value. **We are extremely grateful to the Reviewer for the encouraging comments/suggestions, we agree with their suggestions/comments and have included in the re-revised manuscript.**

Comment 1: In table 2, only p-values were presented. The reviewer strongly suggested to add the cross-tab of outcome by risk factors, in addition to the p-value.

Answer: The corrections suggested by the reviewer are included in Table 2 and Table 3 with crosstab values and p-values in the re-revised manuscript.

With Regards
Dr. Vilas D. Nasare
Corresponding author

3rd Editorial decision

23-Jan-2020

Ref.: Ms. No. JCTRes-D-19-00027R2
Socio-demographic factors and clinical presentation of women attending Cancer Detection
Centre, Kolkata for breast examination
Journal of Clinical and Translational Research

Dear authors,

I am pleased to inform you that your manuscript has been accepted for publication in the
Journal of Clinical and Translational Research.

You will receive the proofs of your article shortly, which we kindly ask you to thoroughly
review for any errors.

Thank you for submitting your work to JCTR.

Kindest regards,

Michal Heger
Editor-in-Chief
Journal of Clinical and Translational Research

Comments from the editors and reviewers: