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Reviewer's report:

General

I am very impressed with the changes that have been made. The article now has a clear, structured format with a comprehensive argument. The language is also greatly improved. The appendices are now more clearly structured and easier to interpret. After consideration, I believe the title is catchy and should be retained.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

None

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a

Reviewer's report

Consenting the Vulnerable: The Informed Consent in Advanced Cancer Title: Patients in Mexico

Version: 3 Date: 11 September 2006

Reviewer: Catherine M Slack

Reviewer's report:

General

The author has responded to most of the suggested revisions from the 6 June review. The English edit has improved the manuscript considerably.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached) However, the following revisions should be made.

Appendices

As requested in the previous review, the Appendices are not the actual survey instruments but also results – the author must clarify that. **DONE**

Table 2: Patients’ perceptions:

“Do you know why you were asked to sign an IC” – some additional cells are in Appendix 2 that are not included here.” After reading the form….improved?”. Figures here do not correspond with figures in Appendix 2. **OK**

“Do you have any comments….?”. The figures do not correspond with figures in Appendix 2. **FIXED**

Table 3: Doctors responses:

“Which of the following…the IC?” The figures are out of line.“Do you receive any type of compensation from the sponsor company?”. Additional cells in Appendix 3 are missing here. **ADDED**

Abstract: **CHANGED**

Under methods: the last sentence should read ‘The patients’ experience of the IC and doctors’ assessment of the IC was evaluated in this study”.

Results: As requested in the previous review, this section should give examples of the results of the patient and doctor survey, e.g. ‘In this study, 66% of patients thought the form was difficult to understand,

49% said they didn’t understand it, and 65% of doctors thought patients couldn’t understand forms. No patient knew the IC was to protect their rights”.

Results:

p 10 reads “after signing the consent, only 2 patients knew what the document explained about treatment risks and benefits”. Where is this data on Table 2? **EXPLANATION PROVIDED**
p11 reads “(Doctors) knowledge of the Mexican General health Law IC requirement was only inferred”. What does this mean? CLARIFICATION WAS MADE
p11 also reads “Most of them (doctors) had …few times (if ever) carefully read the consent form”. Where is this data on the Tables of results or questionnaire? CHANGED

Discussion:
On page 14 the sentence “This work strongly contends”…should read “This work strongly contends that presenting and signing a consent form is not enough for the study to be ethical etc…..” re written

Page 16 reads “The level of perceptions….” This sentence should read “The perceptions of patients in this study about the IC form are not surprising. OK

--------------------

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

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

B DISCRETIONARY REVISIONS

Methods:

p7 Delete the word “qualitative” from the first sentence. DONE

Page 8 “a visual numerical scale was used” by who? Insert the persons who scored the ICs. If it was only one person, state that 2 raters were not used and there is no inter-rater reliability data. OK

Results:

P12 reads “although questions were not made about moral principles and ethical behaviour, all of the responding doctors thought that the survey put in doubt their integrity as physicians (these arguments were made verbally, no written complaint was made”. If this observation cannot be supported by written data, the author should omit this or soften the claim. OK

Discussion
As in the previous review, the discussion should be re-structured to deal with 1) patient data 2) doctor data and 3) consent forms so that it follows the sequence used in the methods and results sections. **DONE**

Page 16 reads “..if the legitimacy of the IC is focussed on this issue, then few patients attending this institution would be able to give a valid consent”. This is too broad an assertion. Rather focus on the key results for this sample (majority thought it was too long, half said they did not understand it)…**OK**

Conclusions

The recommendations are better developed in the conclusions section. The author could also consider developing short-form information sheets (e.g. 2 pages) in line with data that short forms may enhance understanding (c.f. Flory and Emanuel, 2004) and extended contact with a trained research team member (ibid) preferably one with a similar socio-cultural background and worldview to volunteers (Lindegger & Richter, 2000). **OK**


Flory J, Emanuel E. Interventions to improve research participants’ understanding in informed consent for research: A systematic review. JAMA 2004;292:1593-1601.

A few language errors. Can be provided on request.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

It would be interesting to discuss the implications of the observation that doctors do not see payment, gifts, etc as affecting their independence and discuss possible approaches to this dilemma. This could however be done in a subsequent article.

A manuscript about it is in preparation.

**What next?:** Accept after minor essential revisions

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No
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