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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to Suggested Revisions Manuscript BGTC-D-19-00320: Evaluating audio-visual falls prevention messages with community-dwelling older people using a World Café forum approach

Dear editor,

We are pleased to present to you our revised (R1) manuscript entitled ‘Evaluating audio-visual falls prevention messages with community-dwelling older people using a World Café forum approach’ Please find our responses to the comments made by the reviewer(s). All changes to the manuscript have also been highlighted in yellow such that all changes made are easily identifiable.

Thank you for your time in considering our revised manuscript.

Yours sincerely,
On behalf of the all co-authors,
Dr. Lex D. de Jong
Email: lexd dejong@gmail.com

Comments Reviewer #1 and subsequent reply and amendment
1. Some discussion about the need for further work to explore culture/ethnicity (I note only one person did not speak English at home). One would expect health literacy to also play a part and future work could consider exploring that (I note that you included education levels and that only one person was educated to only primary school level). Future work could also explore cohort specific differences in more detail.

We have added wording to a sentence of the Discussion (page 18: “Further limitations…”) stating that participants with different cultural backgrounds and health literacy levels might have offered a different perspective, thereby acknowledging this as a limitation of the study.

2. Also, a typo on p3 line 19: should be 'review' rather than 'reviews'.

We have corrected this typo. Thank you for spotting it.

Comments Reviewer #2 and subsequent reply and amendment

a) It would be helpful to provide a short summary in the text of the purpose/content/unique features of the three prototype videos so readers do not have to break from the manuscript to view them. This would also alleviate the more problematic issue of not being able to access them. I tried several times to follow the link to watch them only to be faced with this error message: "No video with supported format and MIME type found". Obviously, it is important for readers to see the content for themselves which means the authors must ensure the videos are accessible across any access pathway. A detailed description of the purpose/content of the videos would be useful Supplementary material.

We are very sorry the reviewer was unable to download and watch the AV messages. We have checked the URL and the video files and these seem to be fine so we cannot explain why the reviewer got the error message. In any case, to circumvene possible similar problems in other readers - and because we feel it may indeed be helpful - we have added a short description of the three AV messages in the new Appendix 1, and referred to this Appendix where the URL is introduced in-text (page 8).

b) It is not clear why sub-group analyses (i.e., fallers vs. non-fallers) were not conducted in evaluating the impact of the videos. Given the general conclusion that the messages needed to be more "tailored" with a "personal connection", it seems that determining how having fallen impacts a person's response to the video messages is a critical element. It is clear that there are a multitude of differing opinions about the utility of the videos as they stand but it is not clear how fall status affects these. The absence of this level of analysis is particularly confusing given responses such as lines 32-34, pg. 12.

We agree with the reviewer that the participants’ personal experience of having or not having had a fall could be a key influence on their responses towards the messages. We have added a sentence and two references (on page 18, Strengths and Limitations paragraph) acknowledging this as a limitation of the study.

Sub-analyses of fallers vs. non-fallers could indeed have been very informative, but unfortunately this was not possible because the forum discussions were open (anonymous) and responses were not quantified per participant. In other words, we do not know who said what.
c) Similarly, the statement that there was "no consensus" about which video participants "liked best" seems inaccurate given that 58% preferred version 3. As the authors point out, and as is well known in society at large, it is unlikely (if not impossible) to find anything that 100% of people will agree on. That does not mean that every level of disagreement is equally important. In this case, the question that is missed is whether there were any demographic commonalities connected to video 3 being the most popular? Following up in this way could provide the authors with more concrete information on what would enhance "message targeting" and "personal connection". Alternatively, in the absence of developing a video that is 100% effective, perhaps a pragmatic "best bang for the buck" model should be the focus.

We have deleted the wording about consensus about the three AV messages. We could not establish whether there were any demographic commonalities connected to video 3 because responses were not quantified per participant (see previous comment/reply). We have also emphasized that participants identified that video 3 was indeed the most popular.

d) The majority of participant comments do not add anything meaningful to the paper and the authors should carefully consider their value to the text.

We are sorry to hear that the reviewer feels that the majority of participant quotes do not add anything meaningful to the paper. The different standards for the reporting of qualitative research (e.g. COREQ guidelines) state that it is imperative to provide evidence (e.g. quotes) to substantiate the main analytic findings. To this end we have carefully selected the most illustrative quotes as examples for the different themes and subthemes. However, we have deleted three quotes that seem repetitive or not focused on the theme at hand (on page 13 and 14).

e) The Appendix does not add anything substantial. Its contents should be incorporated into the body of the paper (i.e., pg. 5: Questionnaire development, pretesting and reliability)

As suggested we have incorporated all information described in Appendix 1 about the questionnaire development and reliability into the body of the text (page 5-7).

f) It would be helpful if the authors provided some concrete examples of change that would meet the criterion of the videos being "more inspirational". As it stands, this goal is so amorphous it does not seem useful for developing a new generation of advertising. Similarly, the authors note that "inspiration" can be increased through "targeting" and "personal connection" but there is no indication of what changes in these two aspects would actually entail. There will be always be disagreement about the efficacy of a media campaign but the authors should, at least, ground recommendations on specifics.

We have added a specific example in the Discussion on page 16. It is of note that, in the Results section ‘Targeting the message’ (page 12-13), we have already described some specific elements that were suggested by the participants as a means to target the AV messages such as showing a fall or different types of exercise. Future research is needed to show whether these suggestions by the participants are worthwhile.
g) There is a considerable literature from the advertising world on elements that "catch" potential consumers in various media fora. It is not clear whether the authors researched any of this, in concert with the initial participatory research used to construct the video or subsequent to the initial input from community participants, but this would seem to be a basic foundation on which to build an effective media campaign.

We agree with the reviewer that it does not become clear from the current paper that the AV messages in this study were developed based on what is being recommended in the literature. Although this has been described in our previous paper about this topic (in which the same AV messages were shown to several focus groups; reference number 28) we have added a sentence (including two references) to the Introduction (page 4) to make this more clear to the reader.

h) Some attention should be paid to the syntax in various parts of the paper to avoid unnecessary confusion re: current vs. previous research findings or general references vs. specific findings (e.g., pg. 5, lns. 17-19 are not congruent with the references provided, i.e., these references do not provide the details of the specific research in which the "new insights" alluded to were obtained).

We have reworded the sentences 17-19 on page 5 so it should be clearer that we are referring to the World Café methodology and not to actual new insights. We have also carefully reviewed the paper to address any syntax that we could identify as potentially confusing (mainly on page 3 and 4 of the Introduction).