Major Compulsory Revisions

Analysis
- How did the authors ensure ‘accurate recording and reporting of information’ for interviews that were not transcribed?
- Why were some interviews transcribed and others not? How many interviews were transcribed?
- 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.
- 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 report was extracted, for inclusion in this report.

Results
- 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.

Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

Nil

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

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

Grammar, spelling and punctuation

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