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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Dr. Bonnie Jerome-D’Emilia
BMC Women’s Health

9th December 2019

Dear Dr. Bonnie Jerome-D'Emilia

Re: “Perceived Barriers to Early Diagnosis of Breast Cancer in South and Southwestern Ethiopia: a qualitative study”

Thank you very much for your email dated 13 November 2019 and for the comments and suggestions of the reviewers. We have been going through the peer reviewer’s comments and suggestions carefully and have revised our paper accordingly.

Please find for your kind consideration the following documents submitted:

1) A “point by point” response to the comments and suggestions of the reviewer.
2) A new revised version of the manuscript marked with yellow in the main document is attached.
We hope that these changes meet with your favourable consideration, and in the meantime please do not hesitate to get in touch if you require any further information.

Yours Sincerely,

Dr. Adamu Addissie
Email: adamuaddissie@gmail.com

POINT BY POINT RESPONSE TO THE REVIEWERS SUGGESTIONS
Re: “Perceived Barriers to Early Diagnosis of Breast Cancer in South and Southwestern Ethiopia: a qualitative study”

RESPONSE TO THE REVIEWER COMMENTS

We thank the reviewers and editor for the useful and helpful comments and suggestions. We have tried to revise the manuscript in line with the same. All new changes have been highlighted in yellow in the main document in order to facilitate review. The specific changes and response to the different points raised by reviewers are described below.

Editor Comments:

1. Please respond to the concerns of Reviewer 2 and then resubmit

Response:

• Dear Editor, thanks for giving us the opportunity to revise the manuscript for publication up on satisfactory revision. We have accordingly reviewed as per the comments and updated the manuscript and provided point by point responses as indicated below.

BMC Women's Health operates a policy of open peer review, which means that you will be able to see the names of the reviewers who provided the reports via the online peer review system. We encourage you to also view the reports there, via the action links on the left-hand side of the page, to see the names of the reviewers.

Reviewer reports:
Juan Jesús Fernández Alba (Reviewer 1): Dear authors.

2. I congratulate you for a job well done.
I think it is not necessary to make changes to the manuscript.

Response:
Thanks for reading the manuscript and approving it as scientific contribution to be published in this journal.
Tam Truong Donnelly (Reviewer 2): Abstract:

3. This paper addresses an important women's health issue. Structured abstract is well written.
Response:
Thanks a lot for reading and approving it.

4. Table: Need to have tables report some general demographic data of participants (cancer patients and health care providers)
Response:
We included two tables describing the sociodemographic profiles of patients and health care providers.

5. Background
- This section needs to include more information. Authors should include information regarding breast cancer incident and mortality rates in Ethiopia and Africa if statistic available.
- As this manuscript is about early diagnosis of breast cancer, review of literature should include more contextual information related to the current early detection of breast cancer in Ethiopia. It should include information about the country's current breast cancer screening guidelines and public education regarding both breast cancer and its screening.
- If statistics available regarding Ethiopian women's breast cancer screening rates, please include it in this section
Response:
We looked this section carefully and amended some parts according to the suggestion provided. Thanks for the insight and constructive comments.
We highlighted in yellow at the main document for the review.

6. Methods
- Please elaborate on the qualitative methodology. What is the research question(s)/ objective(s); explain why exploratory qualitative study is a good fit for the study and a best way to answer the study's research question(s).
Response:
The research objective is to see the perceived barrier to early diagnosis for breast cancer among breast cancer patients. So we determined to answer the reasons in explorative way to delayed diagnosis among patients and provider level for in-depth understanding.
The detail is mentioned in the document with yellow mark.

7. Procedure needs elaboration on recruitment procedure. How patients and HCPs were made aware of the study? How were they contacted and invited to participate in the study.
Response:
Patients and provider were informed about the study by the research team once the respective facilities provided the permission to the study after discussion with the Medical directors. The providers were considered based on the experience and voluntary participation from the surgery department and oncology clinic to be involved in the study. The patients were recruited in consultation to the surgeons and nurse who can provide the information to the respective questions raised. Still their participation is voluntary and informed as stop at any time feel discomfort.

8. Please elaborate on the inclusion and exclusion criteria.
Response:
The inclusion is mainly experience and involvement in the treatment and care for the professionals. The patients who are above 18 years old and volunteer to participate after invitation by the nurses and
research team were included. We amended accordingly in the main documents and thanks for the comment.

9. Ethical concern (issue related to coercion) regarding recruitment of patients. Were participants informed that participation is voluntary and that they can withdraw anytime without repercussion?

Response:
During recruitment the participation is voluntary based on eligibility and informed to withdraw at any time if they feel unhappy or had discomfort. This was done without any repercussion.

10. Analysis section needs to elaborate on who performed data analysis and how the rigor of data analysis was attained and maintained.
Response:
The analysis mainly done with the main author and all co-authors looked the transcripts and themes and sub themes emerged from the data. In the analysis as mentioned the coding done by two independent coders and then proceeded to develop the themes and sub themes with thematic analysis. From the translation, transcription, coding to themes development in very strict ways and all authors had chance to participate in the validation of the findings.

11. Results:
Well written in some sections, few suggestions as follow.
Socio-demographic characteristic needs more info and would be more effective to put it in a table.
Response:
Thanks again for the valid comments and we have gone through it and included two tables to describe the sociodemographic profiles of the patients and health care providers involved.

12. In section: Patient related barriers, did the author investigate patients' knowledge and awareness of breast cancer screening as well? This is important to include because early detection of breast cancer is directly related to awareness and practice of breast examinations.
Response:
Yes, we have asked during the interview time and elaborated in our finding what they have stated.

13. The subheading "Health care provider related barriers" is misleading would it be more accurate to change to "Health care provider's perception of related barriers"?
Response:
Thanks again for the insight and corrected in the main document.

14. Discussion
It would be very helpful to the readers and health care providers if the authors give specific recommendations to address issues identified in the study's findings.
Response:
Thanks a lot for the comment and as much as appropriate we addressed in the manuscript. But mainly the conclusion part used to convey this message as part of the qualitative study we mainly interested to elaborate what is the findings and comparability to other setting with some extent of recommendations.
Although some parts of the paper is well written, the paper needs editing.
Response:
Thanks again for observing some issues with writing. We have gone through the manuscript and some typos and grammatical correction taken.

We hope these changes will meet with your favorable consideration

Yours Sincerely

Dr. Adamu Addissie