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Reviewer's report:

Summary: This manuscript reports on findings from a qualitative study nested within a larger RCT that addressed the delivery mode of an injury prevention briefing related fire safety messages aimed at parents attending 24 Children's Centres. The qualitative study included interviews with staff of the centres to assess their experiences related to implementation of the IPB to deliver the fire safety messages.

Overall, the questions posed are well-defined and the methods generally well-described. The introductory section provides a good overview of the study and how the current analysis fits into the larger trial. The background development for the Injury Prevention Briefing (IPB) is well summarized. A previously validated tool was used to assess factors affecting implementation of an injury prevention briefing using facilitated and non-facilitated modes of delivery. The methods used are appropriate to the research approach although some additional rationale for chosen approaches for analysis are needed. Results are reported in a thorough manner and the majority of quotes support the findings as presented. The discussion section reads well and addresses major findings and links these to previous literature. Findings have hold important relevance for design of community-based injury prevention intervention efforts and hold implications for delivery of similar types of injury prevention programs to parents attending child centres. Additional comments and suggested changes to the paper are outlined below.

Major Compulsory Revisions.

1. Methods, Para 3: Why was the specific approach using Framework Analysis selected? Including a brief rationale for the choice of this method would be helpful to include.

2. Methods, Para 3: The wording of the last 2 sentences in this para are unclear in terms of which concepts were identified through the analysis process ('devised four implementation levels') and which were assessed in relation to a pre-existing framework? (i.e. the adherence to the Implementation Framework concepts). The current wording refers to both of these having been ‘devised.’

3. Methods: Information should be provided on the number of interviews conducted and additional information describing the staff and the nature of the
work/roles these staff had in relation to the implementation of the IPB. There is mention in the discussion section (strengths and limitations) that the study explored the experiences of a range of staff. Including more specific information about this earlier in the paper (e.g. at the beginning of results) would provide a better sense about makeup of the sample.

4. Methods: Additional information about the conduct of the interviews and management of data would be helpful to include such as whether interviews were audio-recorded, were tapes transcribed and transcripts imported into NVivo to facilitate analysis or was another process used?

5. Methods: The steps or sequence of analysis could be outlined in way that provides greater clarity. There is some repetition in paras 3 & 4 (classification of the level of implementation). The authors describe that coding led to identification of detailed themes. Was there an intermediary step of consolidating codes into categories and then identifying themes from categories?

6. Methods: In the methods section, the ‘implementation fidelity framework’ (Carroll et al) is described as including the adherence, dose, quality, participant responsiveness, and programme differentiation. The coding framework is described as addressing the four elements of adherence, but the other components of the implementation fidelity framework are not mentioned again. Some explanation would be helpful in understanding why some aspects of the framework were utilized and carried through in the analysis and not others. Were these other concepts utilized only for the interview questions? Additional clarity on this would be helpful.

7. Results: For the first four research questions outlined in the Methods section (page 6), the organization of the findings corresponds consistently with the questions, however, for the last research question ‘what improvements can be made to the IPB’ the results appear in different places. Some content related to ‘improvements’ appears in the text on pages 20 and 21 and also in the Box 5. My suggestion is to consolidate this content and increase consistency with the research questions.

8. Results: There are a number of sentences in the results section that do not provide enough detail or explanation to provide a sense of the specific finding. The brevity of the language at times takes away from getting a sense of the meaning. For example on page 15, under c) adaptability and flexibility. While these identified as key attributes, it is unclear what exactly these terms are referring to.

9. Results: On page 12, ‘haphazard attendance and transient lifestyles.’ This statement is not well supported by the quote included – is it fair to say that because people don’t come back that it is because they have a transient lifestyle? Perhaps they stopped coming for other reasons.

10. Page 15: sentence is unclearly worded: ‘...relating contents to parent’s own experience with regular change or repetition.’ It is not clear what type of change
is meant, or repetition of what?

11. Results: Under 2) Specific moderators: The first sub-theme refers to 'staff engagement and training.' While aspects of staff engagement do come through in the subsequent components, the idea of training is not addressed in the quotes or content in a substantive way. While the quote under point ii) mentions that all 70 staff members received training, there is no explanation provided as to what training entailed and how this was helpful or what it contributed to. How did this moderate or affect implementation?

12. Results: Page 20/21: The headings of ‘IPB effects on implementation in the CC context’ and ‘IPB relationship to level of implementation’ could potentially be merged. The second of these is very brief – such little content doesn’t appear to warrant a separate theme and both do relate to the research question about the effect of IPB on implementation.

13. Discussion: New information about the characteristics of study participants is mentioned here which would be useful to address earlier in the paper.

14. Discussion: There is a first mention in this section that research staff were involved in ‘facilitation.’ It is not clear what this is referring to, does it mean researchers participated in the delivery of the intervention as well as the data collection to evaluate implementation? If so, how this might have affected what participants were willing to say and how this was addressed would be helpful to add to the discussion.

15. Discussion: I believe this paper would benefit from including a comment about the usefulness of the analytic approach taken (framework analysis) and whether the results can inform implementation theory in any way. In para 5 of the introduction, the authors mention the potential of the methodology to have implications for implementation research. Additional comment in the discussion section on how the findings could inform implementation theory or research methods would help to carry this idea through.

Minor Essential Revisions.

16. Background, Para 3: This paragraph mentions the five key fire messages and since this is a central feature of the intervention, it would be useful to know what these five key messages entailed or addressed. A suggestion would be to fit this in the text or in Box 1 that already refers to two of the messages.

17. Methods, Para 2: Were the interviews structured or semi-structured?

18. Results: In several instances, it would be more appropriate to indicate that reported findings reflect staff perception rather than factors experienced by parents. For example, on page 12 ‘when parents attended the CC, there were factors impacting on their engagement such as communication difficulties’ etc. These comments more correctly reflect the perceptions held by CC staff. There are other places in the paper where it would be helpful to rephrase the findings to reflect opinions held by CC staff members.
19. Page 18, under ‘other agency support’ it would be helpful to include a brief description of the external agency(ies) which typically employ Health Visitors.

Discretionary Revisions.

20. Background, Para 2: The authors refer to ‘fire-related injury’ as related to children’s age and development stages. It might be helpful to provide a brief definition of what is included in ‘fire-related injury’ so that readers unfamiliar with injury related terminology would have sense of what this term encompasses.

21. Background, Para 3: This paragraph provides a clear overview of the development of the IPB and design of the overall trial. One suggestion is to provide an additional, brief description of what the seven stop process entailed in terms of its development.

22. Methods: A suggested wording change throughout the paper is to change CC’s to CC staff members – this would reflect more clearly who the participants were.

Results: The material in Box 5 could also be summarized in text format. The listing of suggested improvements could be grouped further (e.g. tailoring to specific groups, using more interactive strategies, and simplification of content, increasing visual appeal). Further analysis and interpretation of the findings listed in Box 5 could help to further consolidate this material.

23. Results: Under Factors Influencing IPB implementation, the first sub-theme is titled ‘organisational change, time and resources.’ These seem like three separate ideas that could be subsumed under a broader category (e.g. organizational constraints). The different components could then be outlined in this section.

24. Discussion: Lastly, the final conclusions address the potential importance of parental involvement in design and implementation. While this is an important point, it may be better suited in the discussion/limitations section. It seems that ending a note to emphasize the key contribution of the study and it might influence public health intervention delivery would better reflect the focus and aim of the study.
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