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Author’s response to reviews:

Sophie Staniszewska
Richard Stephens
Editors in Chief
Research Involvement and Engagement
Dear Editors

RE: Evaluating the acceptability of a co-produced and co-delivered mental health public engagement festival: Mental Health Matters, Jakarta, Indonesia

Thank you for your email dated 16th May 2019 and the helpful set of reviewer and editorial comments. I have detailed below how we have addressed each point within the feedback. We feel these revisions have strengthened the paper greatly and would like to thank the reviewers and the Editor for the time they have taken to assess the manuscript.

Reviewer #1: The authors are to be congratulated on all the work that was put in to attempt to co-produce and co-deliver a mental health public engagement festival lasting 6 days at a university in the capital of Indonesia.

Thank you for this feedback.

They were honest in that’s it success was unexpected as the venue was unable to cope with the numbers wanting to attend. It would have been useful to explain that it was free if it was and that tickets did not have to be obtained in advance. The planning process needs a bit of clarification as there was not enough time for some partners to attend - why was that?

We have now added on page 5 that ‘The festival was free to attend and tickets did not need to be obtained in advance. I have checked with our local collaborators and the statement about not all partners being able to host an event was in fact an error. I have now amended this section to state that all partners contributed to the organisation of the festival and delivered at least one event at the festival. This is evidenced in Table 1: Festival activities and attendance.

It was useful to see the programme as an appendix as it was not explained what the films were. It looked more like documentaries as the cast were available to answer questions and the filmmaker was there as well. Can this be clarified?

We have now added detail on pages 4 to clarify that film screenings were documentaries with the cast available for Q&A sessions with festival participants. We have added another reference to Table 1 to direct the reader to more information about festival activities.

Some of the issues raised could be distressing for some of the participants eg Pasung a practice used to chain thousands at home. Was any consideration given to provide a safe space at the venue for personal experiences raised by the event?
Thank you for this valuable point. Festival attendees were told they were free to leave any festival activities if they wanted to and there was additional space within the venue where they could obtain a drink and talk to one of four festival co-ordinators if necessary. We have clarified this on page 5:

Given the content of films and festival activities, attendees were told they could leave activities at any point and that they could talk to festival co-ordinators in another room if they wished. No attendees felt the need to do this during the festival.

Tables are missing or a bit mixed up with the information in different places and should be amalgamated. Needs tidying up.

We have ensured tables are labelled clearly and sequentially and are referred to appropriately within the manuscript.

Good luck with building on this work.

Thank you for your helpful and supportive comments.

Reviewer #2: I found this of general interest especially as the event was in Indonesia. I learned some new facts and was surprised at the restraint of some mental health sufferers. I think that this event was successful and very much essential for the progress, enlightenment and well being of the people Indonesia. The benefit encouragement and learning of the medical staff and interested parties was brilliant. Encouraging and influencing mental health awareness and consideration in the country was excellent. Also generating an interest in research. I liked the priorities that were discussed and listed. A well planned, organised, well documented, successful and worthwhile event. I am afraid that I couldn't give a higher rating because it was only really valuable to those persons involved in Indonesia. I felt that the usual reader would find the article pleasing but of little value for knowledge.

Thank you very much for your review and words of encouragement about the festival. We really appreciate you taking the time to review the manuscript and provide this positive feedback.

Reviewer #3: A well written and explained paper. This type of event is crucial in the dissemination and education of mental health and it is encouraging to hear about such drives in countries outside of the UK. A few comments and potential additions to the paper are suggested.

Thank you for this feedback.
These include:

1. Are the authors considering more events of this nature? A problem with such drives is that they are often a 'one off'. This could be discussed.

Thank you for raising this important issue. We have now included our future plans for mental health festivals within the discussion on page 11.

Due to this success of this initial festival, the authors are planning to hold further events on a larger scale in the future and are currently looking for funding to support these events. Future festivals will include more in-depth evaluation to examine the impact of festival activities on behaviour change.

2. It would be helpful if the age and gender of the personal quotes could be supplied.

We have now added age and gender of person who gave the included quotes.

3. Was the event aimed at adults or did it include children and young people?

We have now added clarification on page 5 that the festival was targeted at adults.

4. The majority of people found out about the event through social media, with very small numbers getting to know about it through the traditional use of flyers or other organisations. The impact of social media on engaging with communities should be discussed.

Thank you for raising this very important point. We have now added detail of the impact of social media on engaging with communities into the discussion (page 11).

The majority of participants who attended the festival found out about it via social media with very small numbers getting it know about it through the more traditional methods (e.g. paper flyers). This highlights the utility of such approaches for engaging with Indonesian communities and reflects the high social media use in Indonesia more generally. Such approaches are likely to be fundamental to the success of future festival related activities and should play a central role in engagement strategies.

5. What are the authors going to do with the evaluation?
We have now clarified on page 11 that the results of the evaluation will be used to inform the design and implementation of future festivals in Indonesia.

Reviewer #4: Main Comments

1. I suggest the authors must use the COREQ Checklist or any other checklist (the Journal subscribes to) to improve the manuscript

Thank you for this valuable feedback. Please see our response to the editorial comments where we document the additional methodological detail we have added into the manuscript.

2. Kindly include in the manuscript the breakdown of the respondents. How many are service use?, how many are care providers? etc.

We have added a row to Table 2: Demographic data of attendees detailing the breakdown of participants.

3. Kindly provide in the manuscript the reason for the about 56% non-response. Was it a sampling issue?

We gave evaluation forms to all participants (n=734) who attended the festival and 323 returned completed forms. We did not ask people why they did not complete forms as completion was not mandatory. We have now amended the manuscript to ensure this is clear or the reader.

4. Is it possible to show who the quotations used in the manuscript are attributed to?

We have now added age and gender of person who gave the included quotes.

5. Considering the nature of the approach of the evaluation, is it possible to provide the educational background of the respondents.

We did not collect this information within the evaluation form so it is not possible to include this within the manuscript.

Assistant co-editor comments
It is good to have a paper from such a different setting, well-written and appropriately referenced.

Thank you for this positive feedback.

We would like the authors to discuss the reasons for the participant gender imbalance.

We have included a discussion of the reasons for the gender imbalance and the potential for over representation from higher SES groups within the limitations section of the discussion (page 11, paragraph 2).

Demographic data collected during the evaluation process demonstrates that the majority of attendees were women and younger people. Previous research also indicates that people from higher socio-economic status are usually overrepresented at arts based activities generally (13). These groups are considered to have greater mental health literacy and as such more positive attitudes towards those with mental illnesses which may limit the transferability of results (20). Future festivals should try to target recruitment towards older people, men and members of the general public to maximise potential benefit. Attendees also felt that a larger venue in a more accessible venue (e.g. Central Jakarta) would facilitate such developments.

Please provide substantially more methodological detail and to tie the Methods section to the Results section, preferably by keeping the sections in the same order in both. The Methods section describes (slim details of):

Descriptive analysis of quantitative survey data Content analysis of free text survey data – this in particular needs much clearer reporting – see reviewers’ comments Prioritisation process The Results section describes the following, but it would be preferable to keep the 3 sub-sections as above, as the paper currently feels somewhat unfocussed:

Nature of the festival – consider a box?

Prioritisation outcome – consider a box?

Quantitative findings

Qualitative findings

We have significantly restructured the methods and results section in line with these helpful suggestions. Both sections now follow the same structure for the purpose of structure and clarity; structured questions, unstructured questions and research prioritisation exercise and included extra methodological detail as requested within each section.
The Discussion section needs to be structured to include brief summary of findings, followed by sections on strengths and limitations, findings in context of previous research, followed by conclusions or implications for future research and practice.

We have revised the discussion section in line with this helpful suggestion:

- Paragraph 1: overview of the findings,
- Paragraph 2: Strengths
- Paragraph 3: Limitations
- Paragraph 4,5,6 Discussion of findings in the context of previous research and discussion of implications for research and practice
- Paragraph 7: Conclusion of findings and implications for future practice

The paper also needs more clarity in places. For instance, ‘Aims of the festival’ include:

To promote future engagement in mental health research To identify future mental health research priorities.

However, in ‘Aims of the evaluation’ there is no mention of evaluating engagement with research or research priorities, only of evaluating impact on mental health awareness. Did the evaluation include a focus on whether these mental health research aims were met?

Thank you for highlighting this. The evaluation did try to identify behavioural intentions related to future engagement in mental health research (related to the aims of the festival) by including a question on this in the evaluation form. The aims of the evaluation have been revised to take this into account.

A specific comment: the video links in results section on p8 do not work because the link has got a spurious closed square bracket on the end of the hyperlink. And the link which promises to address the future engagement thoughts looks the same link although it cannot be opened to check it out.

I apologise for this, I have checked each individual link and updated with correct addresses.

Should you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.
Kind regards

Helen Brooks

Corresponding author