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Author’s response to reviews:

Thank you for commenting on the revised version of this manuscript. Please find responses to specific queries below.

Comment:

Firstly there is a reference on page 11 to a document (YPAG session content) which you refer to adding as an appendix. As far as I can see though, it isn't in the appendices. Also in the ethics section on p.29 you quote INVOLVE best practise but you do not include a reference to these guidelines?

Response:

Many thanks for highlighting this mistake, the sentence referencing an appendix has now been omitted. As the last iteration has more detailed accounts of the content of the sessions with young people, there is no need for an additional 'YPAG content' section, as this would be simply stating information already in the manuscript (see page 10-11). The reference for the INVOLVE guidelines has also now been added.

Comment:

However, we still have doubts about some of the language you have used. The young people are described as being "receptive" and we wondered if you might find a more active description (if appropriate) in view of the doubts expressed by reviewers that the process is not true Involvement or co-production. By "receptive" you may mean that the young people engaged actively in discussion, for example. Perhaps they may even have taken a more active role in
decisions, an aspect that is not brought out in the manuscript as fully as we would expect for a paper about co-production currently.

Response:

The authors wish to thank the co-editors-in-chief for their comments and agree that the use of ‘receptive’ might appear as passive in a co-production context. We have now edited this sentence in the plain English summary, editing phrasing and added further clarity, now reading:

“We found that young people were engaged in discussions around mobile health technologies and valued the opportunity to collaborate throughout the early stages of a development process. Participants actively collaborated through co-design practices and offered insight into design and function expectations and preferences.” (see page 3)

We edited this phrasing in the abstract (see page 4) to ‘engaged’ rather than ‘receptive’ and changed wording in the reflection section (see page 24) to describe young people being ‘responsive’ to group tasks.

In addition, we have added further detail in the design section to try to illustrate the ‘co-design’ nature of this piece, and specifically, referring to the ‘informant’ role our young people played. The design section now reads:

“The discussion guide for the young persons’ advisory group (YPAG) session was designed to be interactive and inclusive. As outlined in co-design literature, low-tech materials, interviews and design feedback on existing platforms or prototypes can all be used as methods for young people acting as informants in a co-design process. The sessions were designed to incorporate this multifaceted approach, and included task-based exercises, group discussion and feedback presentations. The final format was reviewed by colleagues with clinical expertise in Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) and school-based mental health research at the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Maudsley Biomedical Research Centre (BRC). A mock advisory group session was held with a selection of the above colleagues and feedback was given on the content, length and format of the meeting. Furthermore, all materials (including advertising leaflets, discussion guides and supplementary resources) were circulated to clinical academics in CAMHS for comment.

To encourage collaboration with the project and ownership over contributions, participants were encouraged to identify, organise and offer insight into patterns of meaning within the group discussion. This was facilitated through visual grouping tasks and feedback from group members (36). Firstly, a scenario was presented to the YPAGs, describing a young person who had been feeling increasingly anxious and was having difficulty sleeping. Using visual prompts of a wall and ladder, participants were asked to write down perceived barriers for accessing support, as well as opportunities to enable help-seeking. Participants were invited to present their thoughts back to the group, and common themes were identified and discussed. Following this, young people were asked to write down words or phrases they associated with ‘mental health’ and assisted in grouping these into categories. To gain specific feedback on existing eHealth technologies, screenshots of commercially available and research specific mood monitoring apps
were displayed in a gallery format. The YPAG was invited to comment anonymously by annotating the screenshots with likes and dislikes of the design and content. In the two final groups, a blank phone template was provided to give an opportunity for young people to sketch ideas for app features and functions. This section was designed to allow informants to determine the direction of web development processes, and so feedback around specific products (e.g. embedded commercial apps, research web-questionnaires) was essential. Finally, a discussion was had around safety and security, including privacy concerns, use of data and safeguarding procedures. Throughout all YPAG sessions, notepads were provided for young people that did not want to contribute to discussions in person. Furthermore, contact details of the research team were given for any follow up questions/comments, and a debrief leaflet was provided with signposting information to relevant young people’s mental health services and helplines. To ensure young people were actively playing the role of informants, YPAG facilitators allowed the discussion to be led by participants and aimed to listen to group discussion amongst young people. While pre-set prompts and activities were used as a guide, the young people had control over how these were interpreted.” (see pages 10-12)

We hope this now more accurately demonstrates the active role that young people played in this process.

Comment:

Lastly, we would query the word "meaningful" in the lay summary. We understand your reasons for including it and the source for it, but do you mean meaningful in the sense that it was therapeutic for the young people or that it was useful for the researchers, or perhaps relevant for all concerned in terms of the subject matter or effective in terms of the methodology? As a general rule we try to avoid the word "meaningful" in papers (notwithstanding its prevalence) because ironically it does hold different meanings for different readers.

Response:

The authors appreciate this comment, and agree that the ‘meaning of meaningful’ could be ambiguous, and as such, have edited the phrasing in the lay summary (see page 2) to read:

“In order to develop an engaging mobile product that is useful, it is important to involve the end-users (young people) in development, design and testing processes.”

We hope this more appropriately demonstrates that we were interested in seeing what would be useful & valuable to young people.

Comment:

As we commented last time, we think this is an interesting project and we like the paper. However we do feel it could be sharper still in demonstrating that the young people were fully involved and that the project was indeed co-production by the standards that our readers would expect today.
Response:

We hope our iterations have given more clarity to the process of active involvement throughout this co-design, including how the role of ‘informants’ was occupied in this particular co-design. To highlight this further, we have edited the design section as mentioned above (see pages 10-12) and added the following to the plain English summary:

“We found that young people were engaged in discussions around mobile health technologies and valued the opportunity to collaborate throughout the early stages of a development process. Participants actively collaborated through co-design practises and offered insight into design and function expectations and preferences.” (see page 3).

Thank you for taking the time to review this manuscript, we look forward to hearing back.