

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	A multilevel model of stigma and barriers to cancer palliative care in India: a qualitative study.
AUTHORS	Harding, Richard; Nair, Shoba; Ekstrand, Maria

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Dr. Suubi Rhoda Muliira University of Buraimi, Sultanate of Oman
REVIEW RETURNED	04-Jul-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	This is a well-written article that clearly states a novel theoretical model of stigma, communication, and access to cancer palliative care. The methods and results sections are engaging. Also, the novel model is clearly articulated.
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Andrew Donkor University of Technology Sydney, Australia
REVIEW RETURNED	25-Jul-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This article presents the results of a qualitative study aiming to develop a plausible evidence-based model of stigma, communication and access to cancer palliative care in India. The authors want to use the model to develop, test and implement future palliative care interventions. The study combines views of multiple groups – advanced cancer patients, family caregivers and oncologists – to generate a greater sense of depth. However, the authors can provide additional information. Hence, I recommend the following minor revisions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Please provide the most recent cancer deaths data in India (line number 30). Authors could refer to Global Health Estimates 2015: Deaths by cause, age, sex, by country and by region, 2000-2015.2. Please can the authors adhere to either the term explanatory model or plausible model for consistency purposes?3. How was interview transcription process carried out?4. Where was the data managed?5. The outcome of the study depends on conducting data integration, but the authors do not outline the procedures. Can the authors provide more details about how interview data from multiple population was combined?6. Can the authors provide personal information about the research team, such as their occupation at the time of the study and their relationships with the participants?7. How were issues relating to confidentiality and anonymity addressed?8. Was years of experience Oncologists eligibility criteria? If yes, did the authors identify any differences in opinion?
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Christian Ntizimira Harvard Medical School/ Global Health and Social Medicine, USA; Rwanda Palliative Care and Hospice Organization
REVIEW RETURNED	03-Aug-2018
GENERAL COMMENTS	Interesting article and important topic addressed the challenges.

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

REVIEWER 1

4. No suggestions, positive review.

REVIEWER 2

5. Please provide the most recent cancer deaths data in India (line number 30). Authors could refer to Global Health Estimates 2015: Deaths by cause, age, sex, by country and by region, 2000-2015.

WE HAVE DONE THIS

6. Please can the authors adhere to either the term explanatory model or plausible model for consistency purposes?

WE HAVE DONE THIS

7. How was interview transcription process carried out?

WE HAVE ADDED ADDITIONAL DETAIL

8. Where was the data managed?

WE HAVE ADDED ADDITIONAL DETAIL

9. The outcome of the study depends on conducting data integration, but the authors do not outline the procedures. Can the authors provide more details about how interview data from multiple population was combined?

WE HAVE ADDED ADDITIONAL DETAIL

10. Can the authors provide personal information about the research team, such as their occupation at the time of the study and their relationships with the participants?

WE HAVE ADDED ADDITIONAL DETAIL

11. How were issues relating to confidentiality and anonymity addressed?

WE HAVE ADDED DETAIL ON PSEUDONYMISATION OF DATA

12. Was years of experience Oncologists eligibility criteria? If yes, did the authors identify any differences in opinion?

THIS WAS NEITHER AN INCLUSION CRITERION NOR AN AIM OF ANALYSIS

REVIEWER 3

13. No suggestions, positive review.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Andrew Donkor University of Technology Sydney
REVIEW RETURNED	16-Oct-2018
GENERAL COMMENTS	No suggestion

VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Thank you we have

- 1) Edited title
- 2) Edited sample characteristics table.