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Cover Letter

Date: 20/08/2017

To: MC Palliative care Journal

From: Authors

Subject: Revised Manuscript Submission (PCAR-D-17-00084)

Dear Editor and Reviewers;

We are glad to inform you that we submitted the revised version of our manuscript as per the journal guideline titled “Rehabilitation for cancer patients at Black Lion Hospital, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia; a Cross-sectional Study”; Teshager Worku*, Zuriash Mengistu, Agumasie Semahegn1, Gezahegn Tesfaye 1 As we know BMC Palliative care journal is one of the most reputable journals under BMC series publisher. We have revised the manuscript rigorously and incorporate all the reviewers’ comments. We kindly acknowledge the effort of reviewers and took their time for the betterment of our manuscript. We prepared two files as follow to address comments and prepared the revised version for submission.

1. The manuscript clean and well revised version

2. Track change in pdf to show our rigorous revision work and address reviewers comment
For further revision, we are so delighted to receive any further comments for the betterment of our manuscript. Do not hesitate to ask us if you have any inquiries!

With Kind Regards!

Point-by-point response to the review (PCAR-D-17-00084)

Rehabilitation for cancer patients at Black Lion Hospital, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia; a Cross-sectional Study”; Teshager Worku1*, Zuriash Mengistu2, Agumasie Semahegn1, Gezahegn Tesfaye 1

BMC Palliative Care (PCAR-D-17-00084)

Dear Editor and Reviewers;

We are so grateful for the rigorous review of our manuscript and we would like to thank a editor and reviewers for their helpful, educative and scientific genuine review. We made a rigorous revision and accept all of the comments forwarded by reviewers. We prepared track change in addition to the point-by-point response.

Reviewer reports:

Carlos Centeno (Reviewer 1): Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

Major comments

This in an interesting article giving information of the palliative care provision in cancer patients in Ethiopia. This is interesting for many as no data of this kind are published from the region is worth to be published.
I think that need a deep review: what the authors are surveying remain unclear. My understanding after slow reading of the article is that authors are talking about the provision of supportive care/rehabilitation for cancer patients by the professionals attending them, or the patient’s perception of the rehabilitation received from the attending professionals. Right?

➢ Response: we assessed the provision of cancer rehabilitation service and patients utilization of the service.

This became more clear in page 7 when is said "Respondents were asked about the involvements of the health care professionals. Among the total participants, 61.0%(61) had got rehabilitation service by oncologist." So, a clarification has to be given in the title, the abstract and the introduction in order of a right understanding by the reader;

➢ Response: Thank you so much! We have looked at the data and carried out a bit amendment. About 60.4%(61/101) of patients were provided cancer rehabilitation service by oncologist. We have done similar action on the rest of finding as n=deemed necessary. Thanks a lot!

English need to be reviewed by a native speaker.

Minor comments

Title

where is said: Rehabilitation Service Utilization and Associated Factors among Cancer Patients at Black Lion Hospital, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia; a Cross-sectional Study

Could be said: Rehabilitation for cancer patients at Black Lion Hospital, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia; a Cross-sectional Study

➢ Response: Thank you so much, we amended the manuscript as per the recommendation

Abstract

Perhaps a clarification of name and concept explored can be added at the beginning of the article.
Where it is said: "Oncology rehabilitation treatment may result in physical and mental impairment", though that can be said "Oncologic rehabilitation treatment may result in improved physical and mental impairment"

The sentence: A sample of 423 patients who aged 18 years and older were involved in the study has to be in result, and no in method…in the results (abstract) you say: "The leading types of cancer at Black Lion hospital were breast cancer (25%) followed by colorectal cancer (20.6%) and cervical cancer (14.7%), but they are the type of cancer of the sample (those that you recruited), not the type of cancer of the hospital. I don't think that this is separate result. You can say RESULTS: A sample of 423 patients who aged 18 years and older were involved in the study (breast cancer (25%), colorectal cancer (20.6%) and cervical cancer (14.7%), others (%))

- Response: Response: thank you so much, we amended the manuscript as per the recommendation

Material and method

It is correct?: and palliative care science recent period. describe better the oncology department (The hospital was staffed by many health professionals including medical and surgical oncologist) I cannot find a description of the cancer rehabilitation service that is being surveyed. The description of the services offered, staff, training, activities of the service studied is crucial. Differences between Types of Rehabilitation Service provided and "Education Rehabilitation", have to be explained here, as after, in results, you will show different results and tables

- Response: thank you so much, we accept the comment and addressed it as per the recommendation. We describe the staff of the hospital and cancer unit, and the rehabilitation service available in the hospital during our survey period in the method and material section (study area and period). Thank you!

Results

Of them received at least once in rehabilitation service, better: of them received rehabilitation service at least once

- Response: Thank you so much, we accept the comment and addressed it as per the recommendation.
Fig 1 is not relevant to the aim of the article: thank you, we kindly deleted figure one.

- **Response:** Thank you so much, we accept the comment and addressed it as per the recommendation.

Table 2 & 3: This table can be simplified as can be shown the patients than yes receive service the number of patients (% in brackets). It is not necessary to show the no receiving the services. This can be understood easily with the percent and if you add the total n in the heading

- **Response:** thank you so much, we accept the comment and addressed it as per the recommendation.

Joseph Arthur (Reviewer 2):

Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

This is a study which looked at the utilization of rehabilitation services among cancer patients in one institution using a cross-sectional survey. It is an important initial step to help us better understand the role that rehabilitation services play in cancer care at the hospital. I commend the authors for their work. I have a some comments.

1. There were some grammatical errors that need to be corrected. The authors may need to solicit help from other professionals to help rectify those errors and improve the manuscript

   - **Response:** thank you so much, we accept the comment and tried to amend typos, grammar and other errors and to suite the manuscript to the journal standard.

2. The conclusion may be a bit too long and need to be abbreviated to better highlight the most important findings of the study

   - **Response:** thank you so much, we accept the comment and addressed it as per the recommendation.
3. In the conclusion section of the abstract, "So that increase the knowledge of the professionals and comprehensive programs are needed" may need to read something like," This suggests that efforts to increase the knowledge and awareness among healthcare professionals and to create more programs are needed"

➢ Response: thank you so much, we accept the comment and addressed it as per the recommendation.

4. I noticed a pattern whereby the authors would make statements such as "Among the respondents who have got information about cancer (page 6, line 32), "Among the diagnosis of cancer the majority of clients comes to the cancer center with diagnosis of breast cancer..(page 6, line 47). These may sound quite redundant and do not help with the flow of the article. It will be helpful if they can delete or edit some of them in order not to make them sound less repetitive. For e.g. instead of saying "'Among the diagnosis of cancer the majority of clients comes to the cancer center with diagnosis of breast cancer...", they can simply state." The most common cancer diagnosis seen at the center was breast cancer....", or instead of saying "'Among the respondents who have got information about cancer..." they can just state " Of these..."

➢ Response: thank you so much, we accept the comment and addressed it as per the recommendation.

5. Page 5, line 38. They may need to delete the following sentence since it had already been mentioned at line 17 in the manuscript, "The original English version of the questionnaire was translated into Amharic and back translated to English by experienced professionals."

➢ Response: thank you so much, we accept the comment and addressed it as per the recommendation.

6. Page 3, line 54."This number of patients increased to 20140 in 2014..." this may be an error. Please verify

➢ Response: thank you so much, we amend the error “2,040” in 2014.

7. I will suggest that the authors be consistent with either putting all percentages in parenthesis, e.g. 266/388 (68%) or fractions in parenthesis e.g. 68% (266/388)

➢ Response: Thank you! We arrange our findings as per the recommendation x %(x/y).

Thank You So Much!