

RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS' COMMENTS

On behalf of my co-authors, we sincerely appreciate the feedback from reviewers. The critiques strengthen the paper. Below are the itemized responses to feedback. Reviewers' requested actions are highlighted in red.

Reviewer #1	Feedback	Corrections We Made	Where to find corrections
Overall	This manuscript addresses a critical health disparity—triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC) among Black women—by mapping awareness and screening programs using a scoping review approach. The article provides timely, relevant insight into both gaps in existing interventions and opportunities for tailored, culturally responsive initiatives. Given the persistent racial disparities in breast cancer outcomes, this manuscript makes an important contribution to public health, oncology, and social work practice.		
Title/Abstract	<p>The abstract is overall comprehensive and clearly describes the background, purpose, and scope of the review. However, the following improvements are suggested: Suggestions: · Briefly summarize the number of studies included and the primary themes identified. · Clarify whether TNBC-specific content was found in most, few, or very limited programs. · Add 1–2 sentences highlighting implications for practice and policy to strengthen the abstract's conclusion.</p>	<p>The following sentences were added to the abstract:</p> <p>Following a refined search strategy of published literature between 2015-2025, we identified 18 studies to examine for program aims, program components, and strategies for raising awareness. We found that while all selected studies reflected overall gains in increasing awareness and screening for Black women, only one-third of the programs included content related to TNBC, indicating a potential gap in awareness initiatives. We conclude with recommendations on how social work practice can promote awareness of TNBC and breast cancer screening among Black women and discuss critical policy implications, including ongoing debates regarding national screening guidelines aimed at reducing TNBC mortality rates among Black women.</p>	<p>See the full revised abstract [labeled 12-19-25 revision]</p> <p>We appreciate the Reviewer's comments.</p> <p>We feel this revised abstract better reflects the importance of the topic and outlines specifics related to social work practice and policy matters. The revised abstract is 205 words, and to add any more details risks exceeding the APA maximum guidelines of 250 words for an abstract.</p>
Lit Review	Introduction: Well written, with strong justification for the review and clear explanation of the significance of TNBC disparities among Black women		
Methods	Methods: The scoping review methodology is appropriate and aligned with Arksey & O'Malley and Levac frameworks. Search terms, inclusion/exclusion criteria, and screening procedures are clearly presented.		

Results/Discussion	<p>Results: The results are detailed and informative, especially Table 1. The manuscript effectively summarizes each program’s characteristics and whether TNBC-specific content was incorporated. Discussion: The discussion is insightful and synthesizes the findings well. The manuscript clearly articulates gaps in TNBC-focused interventions and identifies practice and policy recommendations supported by evidence.</p>	<p>Comment: We appreciate Reviewer 1’s acknowledgement of the detailed Table in the Results section and the Discussion section which synthesizes findings in a comprehensive manner.</p>	
Conclusions and Implications	<p>Implications: Strong, actionable, and well-grounded in the literature. The implications for practice and policy are especially valuable for social work and public health professionals. Limitations: Appropriate and acknowledge methodological constraints of scoping reviews. Conclusion: Concise and aligned with the purpose of the study.</p>		
Other Comments	<p>The references are current, relevant, and appropriately support the manuscript’s content. The authors include recent sources (2020–2025) and authoritative organizations (ACS, NCI, CDC). Overall, this is a well-executed scoping review that makes a meaningful contribution to addressing breast cancer inequities for Black women.</p>		
Specific Corrections requested	<p>Strengthen the abstract with clearer summary outcomes.</p> <p>Add brief clarification on whether TNBC-specific education was explicitly absent in most programs (this is a key finding deserving emphasis).</p>	<p>As stated above, see new sentences added to the abstract, which indicate the key finding that TNBC was addressed in one-third of the 18 programs.</p>	<p>See the full revised abstract [labeled 12-19-25 revision]</p>

Reviewer #2	Feedback	Corrections Made	Where to find corrections
Overall	<p>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.</p>		
Title/Abstract	<p>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.</p>	<p>The current title is: Addressing the triple-negative breast cancer racial disparity: A scoping review of breast cancer awareness and screening initiatives for Black women</p> <p>We find it difficult to add more to the title; however, the fact that the publication is in a social work journal along with the references to social work practice and policy in the abstract, we believe, is sufficient.</p>	See abstract (12-19-25) revision to submission
Lit Review	N/A		
Methods	N/A		
Results/Discussion	<p>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</p>	<p>We request that Reviewer#2 take a closer look at the Discussion section of the paper. In the Results section, we present the "charting" of the data collected from our included studies in the form of a Table. The Discussion section takes the facts from the Results and puts them into context.</p> <p>Still, to be extra attentive to the Reviewer #2's comments—the Results narrative was re-written to include additional descriptions related to the Table. To further indicate that our synthesis is in the Discussion, we also added this sentence: The following discussion will center on the variations and synthesis of the selected studies,</p>	See revisions to Results and Discussion section (12-19-25 dated revision)

	<p>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. 1</p>	<p>including overlapping themes and details of how aspects of TNBC were featured.</p> <p>Note: The Table is 6 pages and the Discussion section is over 1000 words. We believe this is sufficient analysis.</p>	
Conclusions and Implications			
Other Comments	<p>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.</p>		
Specific Corrections requested	<p>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).</p>	<p>We believe Reviewer #2 will be pleased to find the details requested, including a synthesis of findings, and a structured integration of the included studies—patterns, themes, and concepts.</p> <p>We also reviewed a random list of 10 different recently published Scoping Reviews and found that the difference between relative focus on Results vs Discussion largely depended on the research question, with exploratory scoping reviews similar to our study—where the Table is primarily used to indicate Results.</p>	<p>We appreciate the Reviewer’s comments.</p>