Author's response to reviews

Title: Making progress: the role of Cancer Councils in Australia in Indigenous cancer control

Authors:

Sandra C Thompson (sandra.thompson@cucrh.uwa.edu.au)
Shaouli Shahid (shaouli.shahid@uwa.edu.au)
Michelle DiGiacomo (michelle.digiacomo@uts.edu.au)
Leanne Pilkington (leanne.pilkington@health.wa.gov.au)
Patricia M Davidson (patriciamary.davidson@uts.edu.au)

Version: 3 Date: 10 March 2014

Author's response to reviews: see over
To the Editor

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the reviewers’ comments and my apologies for the delay. Our comments and responses are below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer: Kathrin Strasser-Weippl</th>
<th>We have modified the conclusion in the abstract adding the sentence “Considerable progress has occurred and the momentum of these efforts is likely to increase in the future and will benefit from commitment to long-term monitoring and sharing of achievements.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>….The abstract’s conclusion should be modified to present in one or two sentences the main message of the manuscript. I suggest stating 1) that progress has been made and 2) that these efforts can only be the beginning of a long-term development which needs to be monitored closely in the future.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer: Anton Clifford</td>
<td>All interviews were recorded and a tape and notes based summary of the interview was made. Member checking occurred so that those people interviewed were given an opportunity to check the information that they had provided and clarification occurred with respondents where necessary. Verbatim transcription was not needed in terms of understanding the meaning attributed to phenomenon; rather the interviews were information-seeking against the check list of areas in which efforts to improve Aboriginal participation in cancer control could be measured and the information collected was used to populate a table summarising activity in each cancer council. Additional information reflecting this has been added to the manuscript.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Compulsory Revisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did the authors ensure ‘accurate recording and reporting of information’ for interviews that were not transcribed?</td>
<td>We have added an additional sentence into the methods describing this step in the analysis “The summarised collation of information from all cancer councils was used to identify key issues across organisations and provided insights into both progress and challenges that related to size and capacity.” This sentence occurs immediately before further information about the processes of verification to ensure the accuracy of what was reported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why were some interviews transcribed and others not? How many interviews were transcribed?</td>
<td>The authors’ response to my query regarding the relationship between the larger, original report and this manuscript, should also be incorporated into the methods section as a key step in data analysis, as it describes the process by which information from the larger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More detail on the analysis of interview data is needed. As this section currently reads, analysis simply involved recording the experiences of each cancer council under each interview topic area. The results, however, suggest that interview topic areas were then examined for key issues. As such, this should be included as a step in analyses.</td>
<td>We have now added an extra sentence to highlight this and the process of checking “The salient points were extracted from the larger report and reported / summarised in the paper which was again circulated for input and checking with the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The review of cancer council websites, using the two criteria identified in the methods section, is not adequately presented in the results. If the authors cannot confidently present the results of the website review then I strongly recommend it removing it from the manuscript altogether as its contribution to the paper is minimal.

We accepted that this component could be considered as having a subjective element despite our efforts. Hence, we have taken the reviewer’s advice by removing the method of website review from the overall paper. However, as reference to websites did emerge in the interview data we have still included reference to the role of websites as a portal through which an organisation presents itself and is viewed. As there were recommendations in the report related to websites and the same issues were identified by the participants, we have not changed the recommendations in Table 3.

**Discretionary Revisions**

Nil

**Minor Essential Revisions**

A sentence explaining why the interview topics were selected is needed.

The interview topics replicated those used in the earlier environmental scan. We have added the following sentence “This covered the same areas as those of the previous environmental scan and was developed following a review of relevant peer-reviewed and grey literature on cancer-related services and Aboriginal people and cultural security and discussion within the research team which included Aboriginal people.”

The sentence, ‘Responses were coded following the key themes of the interview schedule...’ is this referring to the areas of the interview guide described in the previous paragraph? If yes, consistency in use of terminology is needed. If no, please clarify in manuscript.

This sentence has been changed to read “Responses were summarised following the key themes of the interview guide with analysis undertaken manually recording the efforts and experiences of each Cancer Council against the major areas of interest.”

A proof read and edit of the manuscript for typos and minor grammatical errors is recommended

Undertaken as suggested

Yours sincerely,

Sandra Thompson