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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Ms Calumpita

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the reviewer's comments on the manuscript. Please find below a specific point by point response to their revisions.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Reviewer BT: There is only one issue and that is the title and the first line in the abstract and the last line in the manuscript... the manuscript is about exploring the critical components [towards] (brackets for emphasis) creating a pathway. But on reading the title and the abstract, the expectation builds up that one would see a clinical pathway.

Authors’ response

The title of the manuscript has been revised to: ‘Everybody wants it done but nobody wants to do it:’ an exploration of the barrier and enablers of critical components towards creating a clinical pathway for anxiety and depression in cancer. The abstract and the last line of the manuscript have also been amended.

2. Reviewer BT: I am also unsure why you have singled out anxiety and depression. What about pain, fatigue, etc.?

Authors’ response

Local initiatives to address pain and dyspnoea are in development in Australia. A sentence to reference these evidence-based interventions is now included in the
introduction and new references inserted (see page 5 line 5).

3. Reviewer BT: Might I strongly recommend you revisit the title and the 2 associated sentences and word them appropriately.

Authors’ response

The title and associated sentences have been revised, see response 1 above.

4. Reviewer DB: 1. It wasn’t clear to me whether this was an exploration of barriers previously indicated in the literature or a straight identification of barriers that each respondent perceived. This nuance depends on how the interviews were framed – which wasn’t clearly explained. Specifically, what questions were asked of respondents? Was there a theoretical basis to the interview schedule or was it more open-ended and exploratory?

Authors’ response

The questions contained in the interview schedule were open-ended and exploratory in nature; this is now clarified in the methodology (see Page 6 lines 6-19). There was no a-priori theoretical basis to the interview schedule.

5. Reviewer DB: It is apparent that the interviews were part of an assessment of a proposed pathway. However, I think that the pathway development is given too much attention up front in the Methods section, considering that it isn’t shared with the reader and really isn’t the point of the paper.

Authors’ response

The methodology has been revised and the background of the pathway development is now referenced elsewhere rather than being prominent in this publication (see Page 6 lines 7-9).

6. Reviewer DB: The Methods should state explicitly that this is a qualitative study.

Authors’ response

This is now explicitly included in the methods (Page 6 line 9) and also in the abstract (Page 3 line 15).

Minor Revisions

1. Reviewer BT (essential): I am curious of the Figure. Was this generated as part of the analysis where the overlap signifies an actual overlap in the data? I am hoping it similar to a ‘wordle’ formation algorithm if so please mention how it was generated... if not well just state that it is an arbitrary rendering. If it is the latter, I would encourage the authors to think out of the box to create that map... it can be done. When the pathway does get created, the dimensions of the themes will be dependent on the player (administrator, IT, oncologist, nurse, psychosocial, etc... will influence the themes differently).

Authors’ response

The figure was generated by the authors to demonstrate the interconnectedness of themes generated. Whilst a ‘wordle’ formation is of interest, it would not
convey the conceptual interlinking of themes in this paper.

2. Reviewer DB: I would suggest a revision to the first part of the title to read, “Everybody wants it done but nobody wants to do it....”
   Authors’ response
   This is now changed in line with major compulsory revision #1.

3. Reviewer DB: It would be helpful if the study objective statement (Background) pg 5 Ln 14 indicated that this was from the perspective of health care providers.
   Authors’ response
   This is now explicitly stated in the aims (Page 5 lines 15-17).

4. Reviewer DB: There are a lot of quotes. Maybe some could be eliminated.
   Authors’ response
   Quotes have now been shortened rather than eliminated, as the quotes provide specific content to illustrate the themes. This has helped to reduce the total word count.

5. Reviewer DB: “pathway fatigue” should be briefly explained before the example given in quotes: Pg 16 Ln 11
   Authors’ response
   This is now clarified on Page 16, lines 3-4.

6. Reviewer DB: Figure 1 should be better explained in the text or removed altogether
   Authors’ response
   In line with minor revision #1 above, there is now a more specific account of how Figure 1 was developed; see Page 7 line 12-14.

Yours sincerely
Nicole Rankin.