Reviewer’s report

Title: The framing of the Australian news media's coverage of medical tourism in low- and middle-income countries: a content review

Version: 2 Date: 28 November 2012

Reviewer: Rory Johnston

Reviewer’s report:

General Comments:
The authors have adequately addressed all of my major concerns that were raised in the original review.

Major Compulsory Revisions
None.

Minor Essential Revisions
1. Tables 2 and 3: Please provide a key or use the full words to clarify ‘F’ and ‘Au’ labels (Female and Australian) within the tables so that they are independent from the Results text

2. Discussion, Paragraph 5, First Sentence: “This is troubling...” ‘This’ refers to the subject in a previous paragraph. Please explicitly reintroduce the subject of interest for the new paragraph.

Discretionary Revisions
3. Tables 2 and 3, Discussion, Paragraph 1: The bulk of the ‘Medical Focus’ categories are procedures, but there is the inclusion of the complication ‘Antibiotic Resistance’ as well, an outlier when compared to the rest of the categories. A rationale for the categories of interest would be welcome – why include ‘Antibiotic Resistance’ but not, for example, ‘Acute Post-Surgical Complications’ / ‘Chronic Post-Surgical Complications’? Why relegate the former category to ‘Medical Focus’ and the latter to ‘Risks’? Were the latter never the focus of the media pieces included?

4. Results, Paragraph 4 / Tables 2 and 3: It would strengthen the analysis to have the ‘Ethical Dilemmas’ category unpacked a bit. Were these primarily bioethical dilemmas around treatment practices (e.g. source of stem cells and organs, informed consent), or wider ethical concerns around equitable health resource use? This is clarified to some degree in Discussion, Paragraph 6, but the paper could benefit from even a brief clarification of the parameters and nature of the ethical dilemmas covered in the media earlier on in the article.

Minor issues not for publication
5. Consider breaking up the sentence in Paragraph 4 of the Methods into two to improve clarity. E.g.

“The first author coded the entirety of the dataset. A selection of 20% of the dataset, chosen by a random number generator from across the television and newspaper corpus, was then analysed by the second author.”

6. Results, Paragraph 2 - Two adjacent commas “variety of reproductive therapies (n = 13),”

7. Discussion, Paragraph 4, Sentence 2 – Missing space “Yet in its presentation”

8. Discussion, Paragraph 4, Final sentence – Awkward sentence structure, consider rewriting. E.g. “Investigations into the presentation of appeal and risk on medical tourism websites have previously noted that testimonials, a common technique in general advertising and used liberally in this Australian media dataset, are of limited value to would-be medical tourists since they provide no insight into the individual level differences that might influence medical outcomes”
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