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Dear Dr Natalie Pafitis,

**Paper number MS: 7717822463492844 – Coverage of Jade Goody’s cervical cancer**

Thank you for forwarding your reviewers’ responses to our paper, and for inviting us to revise and resubmit. We have found the reviewers’ suggestions very helpful and we detail below how we have responded to each of their suggestions.

**Responses to Guiseppe La Torre’s comments**

**Introduction**
- We have rewritten the abstract to give a better balance between subheadings.
- We have shortened the introduction and moved the section that deals with the impact of the diagnosis of celebrity illness to the discussion.
- We have stated the aims clearly at the end of the introduction.

**Methods**
- We have provided a brief description of the Newsbank database and included a reference.
- In making comparisons between the content of the coverage in ‘serious’, ‘middle-tabloids’ and ‘tabloids’ we have used the chi-squared test with 95% as the level of statistical significance.

**Results**
- We have amended the presentation of Table 2 as suggested to ensure that the table is not misleading. Column percentages are now presented.
- We have drawn more attention to significant differences between the genres of newspaper in the text as suggested.
- We have moved the sentence which starts with “This is in stark contrast...” to the discussion as suggested.
- We have amended any p values previously reported as 0.0000 in the table to <0.0001

**Discussion**
- We have added reference to the limitations of the study to the discussion.

**References**
- The reference style has been amended to conform with the journal style.

**Responses to Chiara de Waure’s comments**

1) We agree with this comment and have amended the title.
2) Our objective is to examine the information (and other) content of the coverage of Jade Goody’s illness. We now only refer to another paper which has analysed information about cervical cancer in newspaper coverage of the development and introduction of the HPB vaccine in the discussion.

3) We hope that our objective is now clear in the amended paper. We agree with the reviewer that we are not able to assess directly the impact of the coverage on changes in attitudes and behaviours in women.

4) 631 articles were initially identified by the search, but this included duplicates and articles in the Irish editions of some newspapers which were excluded after screening the 631 articles. 527 unique and valid articles remained for analysis. We have amended the text in the methods to make this clearer.

5) The themes that we describe in the paper were all of the themes that were identified from what was included in the newspaper articles. The broad thematic categories which the reviewer mentions (the prevention of HPV, and the treatment and prognosis of cervical cancer) were not identified as themes in the analysis.

6) A formal statistical reliability was not performed as it would not have been appropriate because the coders worked together throughout all the coding and resolved any queries together on an ongoing basis. A formal statistical test could only have been performed if the coders had coded independently.

7) The statistical analysis (chi-square test to assess whether there were differences in the inclusion of certain themes by genre of newspaper) were performed in SPSS. We have clarified the statistical analysis in the methods section.

8) We apologise for the confusion caused by the presentation of table 2 in the earlier version of the paper; the reviewer was correct in noting that row percentages were presented instead of column percentages. The revised version now shows column percentages. We have amended the title to the table.

9) We have assumed that the reviewer judged that the discussion could be improved rather than implemented. We have made extensive changes to the structure of the discussion and think that it now flows better.

10) We have added a section on limitations to the discussion.

11) We have amended the abstract as recommended by the reviewer.

12) We have clarified that the increase in breast imaging procedures was in the first and second quarters after the publicity about Kylie Minogue’s breast cancer.

13) We have added the relative frequencies in Table 1.

14) We have reformatted Table 2.

15) We do not think it is appropriate to speculate about interventions and initiatives to promote the educational role of mass media in this paper.

16) We have made the suggested punctuation changes.
We hope that you will agree that the paper has been improved by our responses to your reviewers’ thoughtful comments, and that you will now find it acceptable for publication.

Yours sincerely

Shona Hilton & Kate Hunt