Reviewer’s report

Title: Technology assessment and resource allocation for predictive genetic testing: A pilot study of the perspectives of Canadian genetic health care providers

Version: 1 Date: 9 August 2008

Reviewer: Nina Hallowell

Reviewer’s report:

This paper looks at Canadian health care providers’ perceptions of resource allocation issues in genetic testing. In addition to producing some interesting data the paper provides an insight into the types of pressures these health care providers work under and their views about this ethically complex area.

I have a couple of substantive comments about the methods used in the paper.

Minor essential revisions

Sample: it is not clear how “key” or “best member” is defined and therefore the criteria that are used for recommending and choosing potential informants.

The sample contacted – lab directors and clinicians, these are potentially very different groups with a very different role to play in terms of the allocation of genetic testing, and I think it is important to involve both groups in this study. However, it is not clear how many in the final sample come from these groups and thus, how many are involved in patient care. It would be helpful to have this information indeed, information about the final sample is very sparse.

I found the figures difficult to read and, given the tiny sample in the study, am not really sure how much work they are doing. It may be better to have a discursive summary of these findings.

Data collection: the study is described as using in-depth methods, but then the method of data collection, analysis and presentation, suggests that actually these were semi-structured rather than in-depth.

I also wondered whether the authors would like to reflect on the differences in using telephone and email interviews and the different types of data they may generate.

Some of the conclusions are actually discussion and therefore, the latter sections of this paper could do with being reorganised.

Typos etc.
P12 line 2 insert of - a couple of
P10 sentence containing (figX) not sure where fig X is and the sentence does not
correspond to either of the figs that are included.
Bottom p6 sentence starting In all provinces…. Is not a part of the quote is it?
P4 I 21 eleven WERE unavailable.
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