

Article details: 2015-0051	
Title	Family veto in organ donation in Canada: framing within English-language newspaper articles
Authors	Samantha J. Anthony PhD MSW, Meaghan Toews LLM, Timothy Caulfield LLM, Linda Wright MHSC MSW
Reviewer 1	Abraham Rudnick
Institution	Department of Psychiatry and Behavioural Neurosciences, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ont.
General comments (author response in bold)	<p>Comment: On page 4. In the second paragraph about framing, elaboration on the process of the initial in-depth analysis would be helpful.</p> <p>Response: The Methods section (pg. 3) has been amended to include additional details on the analysis process.</p> <p>Comment: On page 6, in the histogram of distribution of publications, it stands out that there is a trend over the years for fewer publications on this matter. Discussing that in the Interpretation section would be helpful, e.g. is this matter becoming a moot point as time goes by?</p> <p>Response: To address the trends in the histogram of distribution of publications, the Results section (p. 5, paragraph 1) of the manuscript has been amended to include the following: "Peaks in distribution of publications primarily reflect activities related to organ donation awareness campaigns, the release of public survey data and proposed legislative changes". These activities included a cross-Canada walk-a-thon in 2000, legislative amendments in Ontario in 2000, and a debated private members bill in Ontario in 2006 proposing a 'presumed consent' organ donation system.</p> <p>Comment: Some of the references are missing issue numbers; where available, that should be added.</p> <p>Response: The references have been reviewed and issue numbers added, where available.</p>
Reviewer 2	Marianne Dees
Institution	Radboudumc IQ healthcare, Nijmegen, The Netherlands
General comments (author response in bold)	<p>Comment: From the introduction it is not evident that and/or why the search is restricted to articles in English. There might be another portrayal in French language articles related to the area. Thus the results might not be generalized to Canada as a whole. It is not correctly mentioned until page 10 line 21.</p> <p>Response: The decision to limit our search to English newspapers was a conscious one. This decision was made due to budgetary constraints. This information has been added as a study limitation in the Interpretation section of the manuscript (pg 10, paragraph 1).</p> <p>Comment: Page 3 Line 9: The method section does not provide sufficient information about how the initial in-depth analysis was performed nor how agreement about the coding categories was reached. What was the background of the two coders? Did they use a computer program as an aid for the qualitative analysis?</p> <p>Response: The Methods section has been amended to include additional information concerning the data analysis (pg. 3, paragraph 1 & 2; pg. 4, paragraph 2). NVivo 10 software was used for management of qualitative data.</p> <p>Comment: Page 4 Results: 72% published in Ontario, 21% in Ottawa Citizens, Toronto Star 8%, Hamilton S 7%. What is the geographic covering of these newspapers, the number of readers, and there geographic spreading of these readers? What is the political orientation, and possible religious background of the newspapers. Is there a top ten of authors / sources?</p> <p>Response: Additional information pertaining to the top newspapers in Ontario has been added to the Results section of the manuscript (p. 5, paragraph 1) as follows: "The Ottawa Citizen is a daily newspaper distributed in Canada's capital with an average print readership of 208,000. The Toronto Star is Canada's largest daily newspaper, with the largest readership in the country. The Star's print readership in the Greater Toronto Area is 999,000 readers on an average weekday".</p> <p>While the editorial and political orientation of the Citizen has varied with its ownership, the Citizen is considered slightly to moderately conservative in bias. Whilst the political orientation of the Toronto Star is at times disputed it is generally considered to be the most liberal of Canada's major papers, with a slight to moderate liberal bias.</p> <p>As per above (Response #10 to Editor's Comment), the following information has been added to the Results section of the manuscript (pg. 6, paragraph 1): "Five journalists authored two articles and one authored three articles. The remaining 120 articles were authored by different journalists."</p> <p>Comment: Page 6 line 56: cited occurrence 5 - 70 percent: in which newspapers were which numbers mentioned?</p> <p>Response: Fifteen (11 %) of the articles referenced the incidence rate of family veto. The incidence rate was cited across eleven different newspapers.</p> <p>Comment: Page 10 line 60: Principle of autonomy: suddenly appears in the interpretation. Some words and references might be spent on the subject in the introduction.</p>

Response: The principle of autonomy emerged from our findings as one of the ethical issues associated with family veto and as such is introduced within the Results section of the manuscript (Page 8, paragraph 3). We are also mindful that the Introduction section should be no more than two paragraphs.

Comment: Page 11 and further: I miss: based on the results can be concluded and what exactly are the recommendations towards politics and research that result from the findings

Response: We have amended the Interpretation section to make more concrete recommendations for future research and/or policy change.

Comment: The mentioned gap between law and practice is cannot be concluded from this research. The conclusion is that these newspapers provide wrong information. So the question is: how do we ensure that newspapers provide correct information?...can we ensure?...Do we want this?...And another question is: is there a gap between law and practice? Research among physicians and hospitals regarding barriers and policies?

Response: We have replaced the discussion of the law/practice gap in the Interpretation section with a discussion of our results showing particular areas of inconsistency in media coverage to make specific recommendations for future research and/or policy change.

Comment: What are the limitations?

Response: Study limitations have been added to the Interpretation.

Comment: Page 10 table 4 a number is lacking: April 2.201 instead of 2013.

Response: Table 4 (page 12) has been edited to reflect this change.