



Qualitative Analysis of Barriers and Facilitators to Cancer Screening in Low-Income Communities

Michael E Singer¹, Mathias Bastholm^{2*}, Haixin Qiu³


¹ Department of Biomedical Informatics, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, TN, USA

² Research Unit for General Practice, Department of Public Health, University of Southern Denmark, 5230 Odense, Denmark



³ Department of Medicine, Marshall University Joan C. Edwards School of Medicine, Huntington, West Virginia

* Corresponding author email address: haixinqiu@marshall.edu

E d i t o r

Luis Felipe Reynoso-Sánchez
Department of Social Sciences and
Humanities, Autonomous
University of Occident, Los
Mochis, Sinaloa, Mexico
felipe.reynoso@uadeo.mx

R e v i e w e r s

Reviewer 1: Zahra Naghsh
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran.
Email: z.naghsh@ut.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Yaghob Badriazarin
Associate Professor of Sport Sciences, Tabriz University, Tabriz, Iran.
Email: badriazarin@tbzmed.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1 Reviewer 1

Date: 19 May 2024

Reviewer:

"The abstract states, 'A qualitative research design was employed utilizing semi-structured interviews to collect data from 24 participants residing in low-income communities.' Please specify the exact qualitative methodology used (e.g., phenomenological, grounded theory) to enhance clarity."

"The statement 'Data collection continued until theoretical saturation was achieved' is vague. Provide more detail on how saturation was determined and the specific indicators used to conclude that saturation was reached."

"The 'Semi-Structured Interview' section mentions that an interview guide was developed. Include an appendix with the full interview guide or a summary of the key questions to provide readers with a clearer understanding of the data collection process."

"The 'Findings and Results' section provides demographic data but lacks detailed context. Consider adding a table summarizing demographic characteristics and any relevant sub-group analyses that were conducted."

"Thematic analysis was employed, but the process is not fully detailed. Describe how themes were identified, how many coders were involved, and how inter-coder reliability was ensured."

"In Table 1, the subcategory 'Fear and Stigma' includes 'Distrust in medical procedures.' Provide specific quotes from participants to illustrate this theme and enhance the richness of the data presentation."

"In the discussion, you state 'Financial barriers were a prominent theme consistent with findings from multiple studies.' Provide a deeper interpretation of how financial barriers interact with other identified barriers, such as accessibility issues."

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

1.2 Reviewer 2

Date: 20 May 2024

Reviewer:

"In the introduction, the sentence 'Various studies have identified a range of barriers that prevent low-income individuals from participating in cancer screenings' lacks specific citations. Please integrate specific studies that have identified these barriers to strengthen the argument."

"The introduction provides a broad overview of barriers and facilitators but lacks a clear statement of the research hypothesis. Consider adding a hypothesis statement that links the literature review to the research objectives."

"In the 'Study Design and Participants' section, you mention recruiting through community centers and local clinics. Explain why these specific recruitment sites were chosen and how they contribute to the representativeness of the sample."

"Discuss how the findings of this study compare to similar studies conducted in other geographic or cultural contexts. This will help in understanding the generalizability of the results."

"Expand on the practical implications of your findings. For example, discuss how community health workers can be more effectively utilized to address the identified barriers to cancer screening."

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.