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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer #1

General Comment

01) Fathers and young parents should be more involved. They should find a way for them to be interested

No action taken. This is a limitation of the work and has subsequently been acknowledged in the discussion (paragraph three).

Reviewer #2

General Comment

01) Those who are seldom heard (better label than “hard to reach”)

Both instances were the phrase “hard to reach” was used were changed to “seldom heard voices”.

Plain English Summary

02) The Plain English Summary contains quite a few technical words e.g. engagement, drafting, pilot, tool
Drafting changed to testing.

03) Confused as to how CEnR reviewed current methods of community engagement

Changed to reviewing tools which could be used for community engagement for more clarity

Reviewer #3

General Comment

01) It would be worth explaining why the public were not involved in Phase 1 of the study at least in the development of the identification of the original factors

A sentence was added to the design section stating - Local community members were not included in Phase 1 to ensure any factors that could cause distress were removed or reframed appropriately.

02) Consider the literature on co-production as there are some similarities

No action taken. Co-production literature was reviewed however as stated by Reviewer #3 this was very similar. We chose not include this to ensure the paper was kept concise.

Plain English Summary

03) Need further explanation of Photo Grid tool. Many readers will be unfamiliar

A sentence was added stating - The Photo Grid tool is a flat square grid on which photo cards can be placed. Participants were asked to place the photos they considered most important for early child health and development at the top, working down to those less important at the bottom.
04) Begin with something like this paper reports on the development of a tool that could be used to gain insights etc.

The first paragraph of the plain English summary was reformatted to reflect this recommendation.

05) Hard to access – the phrase “seldom heard voices” is better.

Both instances were the phrase “hard to reach” was used were changed to “seldom heard voices” as recommended earlier by Reviewer #2.

Background

06) First line. Perhaps add in usually after early years.

The word usually was added.

Design

07) Table 1. I found the third column quite confusing I would lose.

No action taken. The decision was made to keep the third column as this was not highlighted by other reviewers suggesting they found its inclusion warranted.

08) Column 2, Should that be “principles” rather than “definition” in the column heading?

The word “definition” was changed to the word “principles”. This was also altered in column 3 for consistency.
09) More information needed on where these principles came from. Did you review various CEnR approaches?

No action taken. The last sentence in the design section clearly states the origin of these principles.

10) P6 perhaps put the phases in bullet points or a further table - I think this would make this para clearer

No action taken. As issues with clarity were not highlighted by other reviewers this remains unaltered

11) In the third line on p6 you mention local professionals but don’t tell us who they are until we reach participants – perhaps let us know that further information will be provided in the following section

A sentence was added stating - Further information will be provided on participants in the following section.

12) You tell us that an initial list of factors was drawn up, how?

Three words were added – by local professionals – for clarity

Participants

13) Which health professionals?

The word – midwives – was added for clarity
14) More information is required on how people were recruited in phase 2

A sentence was added stating - They were asked to participate in the development of a new community engagement tool which would be piloted in their setting.

15) An explanation needs to be given somewhere about venue-based time-space sampling – how did this proceed, how were people recruited?

Two sentences was added stating – (1) This is a probability-based strategy for recruiting members of a target population congregating at specific locations and times. (2) . . . .were asked to take part in an activity looking at priorities for early child health and development.

16) You refer to sessions do you mean opportunities to pilot the tool

Sessions was changed to opportunities to pilot the tool and provide insights into priorities for early child health and development

17) Did you have a particular number of participants in mind re recruiting to the pilot study 208 out of how many?

A sentence was added stating - Substantial interest in the activity allowed the target sample of 200 participants to be exceeded.

Results

18) You make reference to an informal meeting (and on p9 informal discussions) of the professional workers. I’m not sure what this means just say meeting.

The word informal was removed from three sentences on pages 9-10
19) I’d like to see a short explanation of each of the three “traditional research methods” that were discussed.

A short paragraph was added to Results Phase 1 - Q-Methodology uses a sorting technique to examine “points of view” around a topic. Participants are grouped by similar opinions. Rank Order Methods involve participants placing a set of items in some form of order. The measure of order can include liking, effectiveness, importance etc. Photo-elicitation is a method of interviewing which uses visual images to elicit information from participants.

20) P10 a reference is made to a recording sheet. I would like more information on this – some explanation of the questions. E.g. how many open or closed, some examples etc.

A short paragraph was added to provide details about the recording sheet - This included four open-ended questions which enquired about (1) the ordering of the cards, (2) the relevance of the factors, (3) opinions about the usefulness of the Photo Grid tool as a research and engagement tool and (4) provided the opportunity for any other information to be provided.

Reviewer #4

General Comment

01) On page 9 the authors give a useful account of why other research methodologies were problematic for the task at hand. This discussion or some reference to it could be introduced earlier

No action taken. This is introduced on page 5

02) The authors do not really comment on whether the results of the project using the new method would be considered valid/robust
A paragraph was added stating - The Photo Grid tool appears reliable with feedback about the tool relatively consistent across all participants. Future research utilising the tool in another area with similar deprivation and literacy levels may enhance its reliability. Similarly, the Photo Grid tool was successful in engaging participants in research and eliciting discussions around important factors associated with early child health and development. This suggests that the tool is a new, successful method of gaining information on this subject. Future research adapting the tool to prompt community discussion around other topics will allow for a further assessment of its validity.

Editor

General Comment

01) We would prefer hard to hear rather than hard to reach

Both instances were the phrase “hard to reach” was used were changed to “seldom heard voices” in line with previous recommendations from Reviewer #2 and #3

02) A more thorough discussion of the validity of results obtained by all means (including the one assessed by this paper) would be particularly welcome

A paragraph has been added to the end of the discussion section in line with previous recommendations from Reviewer #4