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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to the editor and reviewer

Dear editor and reviewer,

Thank you for your comments on our revised document. Unfortunately, we misunderstood the first comments given by reviewer 2, and hence revised our document not as suggested. The new comments made it more clear to us, what was meant by the editor and reviewer 2. We have now made huge adjustments to our article and focused on our own development process. We have added a figure/model of our process as well. Instead of giving an overview of the results of the development of two interventions, the aim of the current article is to provide insight in the systematic developmental process of two evidence-based interventions to stimulate injury preventive behaviour in runners and skiers, in which IM and KTS are used as theoretical background (overview of aspects to be covered in the development of an intervention). In this article we show why we adjusted the ultimate steps in the process to meet requirements of the intervention and our target group.

Editor Comments:

This revision has not adequately addressed the serious concerns remarked by the reviewers. Reviewer 2 and I both agree that this work comes across too much as a descriptive case study.

A strong overview of the processes that you use and the rationale for each step in the process is necessary. For the scientific community to benefit and develop interventions based on your investigation, you must frame it as a template or useful model. These issues surrounding the rationale of the study and identifying elements that can be extrapolated out in a meaningful way
need to be addressed to be considered for publication. Please see to this in the revised submission.

Response to the editor: We have made huge adjustments to our manuscript and hope it’s more suitable now. We have focused on our process and added a model of our process, including, all the steps and research activities we have made or performed.

BMC Sports Science, Medicine and Rehabilitation operates a policy of open peer review, which means that you will be able to see the names of the reviewers who provided the reports via the online peer review system. We encourage you to also view the reports there, via the action links on the left-hand side of the page, to see the names of the reviewers.

Reviewer reports:

Reviewer 2 (Reviewer 2): "REVISION ASSESSMENT FROM THE ACADEMIC PEER REVIEWER:

Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? No

Author’s response: Unfortunately, we misunderstood the previous comments.

Reviewer comments: The authors have done a good job explaining what they did to develop the two interventions. The main question I have is - why should readers be interested in this description?

I don't think the authors have provided a general or strong enough overview of the process that they used or the rationale for each step in the process. Therefore, the whole paper comes across as a descriptive case study of what was done, rather than a useful model or template, supported by a case study, that others can follow to develop interventions. I think this stems from the fact that the authors set out to describe "the development of two interventions to change injury preventive behaviour, to give insight in the execution of the development of an intervention, e.g. in the required steps, the different research methods used and, the lengthy and time consuming development process." I would like to know much more about what the authors learnt from the process.

Author’s response: We hope this is now more clear now, since we focused on our process and explained what we have done and why we did it that way.
In the background section (Pg 4, Line 55), the authors state that "'In sport injury-prevention research, interventions have often been developed following structured and systematic processes often applied in health promotion research.'" I don't think this is accurate, and there are no references to support this statement. In fact, I think that the real strength of this article is that it is one of a very few that outlines how a health promotion intervention development process has been applied in the sports injury prevention field. The problem, from my perspective, is too much of the article is spent describing the specifics of what was found as a result of applying the process, rather that clearly describing the process, how it was applied, what was learnt and why others should also use it. As articulated by Reviewer 1 "'tell the story of the rigorous process of intervention development. That seems to be a key aspect of this study - the process.'"

Author’s response: We focused on our development process now, and hope this will give new insight for other researchers.

In my original review I suggested that the paper would really benefit from a visual representation of the intervention development process that could be used as a template for readers to follow when developing interventions in the future. In response to this the authors provided visual representations of the IM and KTS models/frameworks without locating what they had done within each of these diagrams. To me, this should be the starting point for this type of article - with the text then providing the case study detail of what was done and what was learnt."

Author’s response: We have added a visual of our process and used it as a starting point of our article.