

Reviewer-2

The manuscript addresses an issue of clear scientific and public health significance. The mortality gap in breast cancer between Black and White women—particularly the disproportionate burden of triple-negative breast cancer—is well documented, yet the field still lacks a consolidated understanding of how awareness and screening programs specifically serve Black women. By mapping existing interventions and highlighting how few of them integrate TNBC-specific content, the manuscript draws attention to a substantive gap in both practice and research. That contribution is meaningful: it not only synthesizes scattered evidence but also points toward an actionable direction for future program development and policy design.

The current title adequately reflects the general focus of the manuscript. However, the paper devotes substantial attention to the implications for social work practice and the ways in which social workers can engage with breast cancer awareness and screening initiatives. To better capture this dimension of the manuscript's contribution, the title could be strengthened by incorporating an explicit reference to social work or practice-oriented perspectives.

The abstract, in its current form, is overly general and does not sufficiently convey the manuscript's key contributions. To strengthen it, I
The abstract, in its current form, is overly general and does not sufficiently convey the manuscript's key contributions. To strengthen it, I
Overall, the manuscript addresses an important topic; however, several sections require further development to strengthen the clarity, analytical depth, and disciplinary relevance of the work. 1. Results Section The current Results section is too brief and provides only minimal narrative description. It lacks a

synthesized presentation of findings derived from the literature search. A scoping review typically requires a structured integration of the included studies—identifying patterns, themes, or conceptual domains—rather than listing or briefly summarizing individual studies. As written, the section does not sufficiently demonstrate how the evidence converges or diverges. The authors are encouraged to reorganize the Results section around major themes or conceptual categories that emerged from the included studies (e.g., culturally tailored interventions, navigation-based programs, digital approaches, TNBC-specific content). Doing so would provide a clearer understanding of the landscape of interventions and strengthen the analytical contribution of the review. Overall, the manuscript addresses an important topic; however, several sections require further development to strengthen the clarity, analytical depth, and disciplinary relevance of the work.

1. Results Section

The current Results section is too brief and provides only minimal narrative description. It lacks a synthesized presentation of findings derived from the literature search. A scoping review typically requires a structured integration of the included studies—identifying patterns, themes, or conceptual domains—rather than listing or briefly summarizing individual studies. As written, the section does not sufficiently demonstrate how the evidence converges or diverges. The authors are encouraged to reorganize the Results section around major themes or conceptual categories that emerged from the included studies (e.g., culturally tailored interventions, navigation-based programs, digital approaches, TNBC-specific content). Doing so would provide a clearer understanding of the landscape of interventions and strengthen the analytical contribution of the review. The references used in the

manuscript appear appropriate, sufficiently recent, and adequate to support the scope of the review.