

## PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

### ARTICLE DETAILS

<b>TITLE (PROVISIONAL)</b>	Too much information? A document analysis of sport safety resources from key organisations
<b>AUTHORS</b>	Bekker, Sheree; Finch, Caroline

### VERSION 1 - REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Osman Hassan Ahmed Department of Physiotherapy, Poole Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Longfleet Road, Poole, Dorset, BH15 2JB
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	26-Dec-2015

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>I was grateful for the invitation to review this paper, and I very much enjoyed reading it. As a believer that qualitative research should play more of a role in sports medicine, I was pleased to see the robust and rigid approach adopted in this study. I hope that the comments I make will might be incorporated to tighten the paper further, and would look forward to seeing this paper (and the subsequent associated studies) in the literature base in the near future.</p> <p>Page 2, Line 24: "Sports settings"- consider changing to "Individuals involved in sport" or similar. Page 2, Line 27: Include "and" after "resources available" Page 2, Lines 28-31: This is an extremely valid point. Page 3, Lines 47-48: I am aware of what is meant by "Dr Google" but am not sure that all readers would be. Possibly replace with "searching the internet". Page 3, Line 48: It states "recently shown" but the reference used (#3) is from 2003. Either the word recently should be removed or a different reference chosen. Page 3, Lines 58-61: I strongly agree with this point, and referencing it appropriately would help to strengthen the argument. There might also be some discussion of other issues related to electronic dissemination (size and reach of audience, impact of the manner of media, peer-to-peer sharing). Page 3, Line 63: "Therefore" appears redundant and should be removed. Page 4, Lines 69-85: The argument is strongly made for the inclusion of the six organisations, but I was left wondering slightly about the organisations not included. Although they would not have to be mentioned by name, it might be worth giving some reasons why they were not included (ie "exclusion criteria" as well as the "inclusion criteria" listed)</p>
-------------------------	---

	<p>Page 5, Line 90: Im not familiar with the term "peak agency" and the other explanations in this sentence do the job sufficiently I feel.</p> <p>Page 5, Line 103: The page number is listed here in the reference which is not in keeping with the rest of the referencing format.</p> <p>Page 6: Two factors I liked about the approach taken were the direct email as well as the online approach, and the double-check of the websites 6 months later. This shows a good degree of rigor.</p> <p>Page 9: One aspect I would have liked to see more in the discussion is the quandry between having multiple sources of information (where there may be some overlap/disagreement), and having one overall source of information (which may be open to clinical or financial bias). In the current era I think it is unfeasible for there to be one sole source of information but the benefits of multiple information sources could be discussed more</p> <p>Page 9: Although the study was conducted in Australia, what are the implications of a wider scale? Could the results be extrapolated globally?</p> <p>Page 10, Lines 195-197: Resources, staffing and mandate are all factors and motivation could also be included here. Why should organisations do this? Are there any motivations/penalties that could be used for this? (ie "carrot vs stick")</p> <p>Page 10, Lines 200-505: This is a very lengthy and bulky sentence and should be reworded.</p> <p>Page 10, Line 210: I strongly agree taht the end-user perspective is taken into account and hope that the authors can investigate this in the future using a similarly rigorous manner.</p> <p>Page 10, Line 217: "Rivalry of resources" is a good way to summarise this situation.</p> <p>Page 13, Lines 270-278: This paragraph reinforces the need for a co-ordinated approach, and I hope that following this series of studies that this will be able to occur.</p> <p>Page 15, Line 320: Correct abbreviation is "Am J Public Health"</p> <p>Page 17, Line 373: Correct abbreviation is "Am J Prev Med"</p> <p>Pages 22/23/24: There are no titles listed for any of the Figures but am not sure if this is an editing issue?</p> <p>Page 22: I would remove the superscript numbers in the table as they are confusing to look at. A simpler way of showing the results would be to state "6 organisations", "285 resources", etc.</p> <p>Page 26/27: I also found it consusing to read through each section here as the hyperlinks were not put in brackets and it made it look awkward. Putting these into brackets would improve the appearance of it.</p>
--	--

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Jaime DeLuca Towson University, USA
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	27-Jan-2016

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>This manuscript is well-written, clear, and flows logically. Everything is explained well and there are lots of supporting documents and tables/figures included to enhance reader comprehension.</p> <p>Authors state that the "quality" of the content in the NoGAPS documents was not assessed - which seems fair and appropriate to me - however I still feel as though the 'scope' component of the objective statement is not adequately covered in the article. The authors could provide more information regarding the content of the documents that is not specifically related to their quality. The results seem incredibly brief. Are there other dimensions of your findings</p>
-------------------------	---

	<p>that you might be able to report? In some ways, the tables and figures presented seem to be a stand-in for writing out some of the important results. The results did not convey an "in-depth qualitative document analysis approach" -- without some additional results and analysis, the research almost comes across as though you counted materials from websites. Please detail some of the qualitative findings from the thematic coding. Some additional items to cover might include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-what kind of responses did you get from the emails that you sent? (not related to which documents they sent - rather was there interest in this study? did they have any other comments? etc.)</li> <li>-is there any content related to the "consultation" you had with the NoGAPS organizations, as mentioned in the limitations, that you might include?</li> <li>-could the discussion section further analyze some of the specific results/findings you discovered in relation to the actual document content on each sport safety issue? Not the quality, but the content - what type of content was included? how robust was this information? Where was it synthesized from? Who developed the document? Were there pictures and diagrams? How complicated was the text? Was it accessible to the general public? Did the documents refer readers to additional resources?</li> <li>-regarding the websites - were the documents easy to find? what is the traffic like to these websites - i.e.: who actually sees this stuff? how else is this information disseminated?</li> </ul>
--	--

### VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Reviewer Name: Osman Hassan Ahmed

Institution and Country: Department of Physiotherapy, Poole Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Longfleet Road, Poole, Dorset, UK

Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None declared

Please leave your comments for the authors below

I was grateful for the invitation to review this paper, and I very much enjoyed reading it. As a believer that qualitative research should play more of a role in sports medicine, I was pleased to see the robust and rigid approach adopted in this study. I hope that the comments I make will might be incorporated to tighten the paper further, and would look forward to seeing this paper (and the subsequent associated studies) in the literature base in the near future.

Page 2, Line 24: "Sports settings"- consider changing to "Invididuals involved in sport" or similar.  
-Rephrased to 'People working within sport settings...'

Page 2, Line 27: Include "and" after "resources available"  
-Amended

Page 2, Lines 28-31: This is an extremely vaild point.  
-No change required

Page 3, Lines 47-48: I am aware of what is meant by "Dr Google" but am not sure that all readers would be. Possibly replace with "searching the internet".  
-Rephrased to 'searching the internet, or what is colloquially referred to as 'Dr Google'.

Page 3, Line 48: It states "recently shown" but the reference used (#3) is from 2003. Either the word recently should be removed or a different reference chosen.

-Amended to 'has been shown'.

Page 3, Lines 58-61: I strongly agree with this point, and referencing it appropriately would help to strengthen the argument. There might also be some discussion of other issues related to electronic dissemination (size and reach of audience, impact of the manner of media, peer-to-peer sharing).

-Amended to include reference.

-Whilst we agree that a discussion of other facets of electronic dissemination is a valuable consideration, we have not included a discussion of it because we did not attempt to assess the reach or impact of the resources we collated.

Page 3, Line 63: "Therefore" appears redundant and should be removed.

-Amended

Page 4, Lines 69-85: The argument is strongly made for the inclusion of the six organisations, but I was left wondering slightly about the organisations not included. Although they would not have to be mentioned by name, it might be worth giving some reasons why they were not included (ie "exclusion criteria" as well as the "inclusion criteria" listed)

-The choice of relevant organisations fell under the scope of the original National Guidance for Australian Football Partnerships and Safety (NoGAPS) project, of which this is a sub-study. Details of the selection of these organisations –has already been published in the study protocol paper (reference 6). Since we submitted this paper, our team has had another paper accepted for publication that describes the partnership organisations in detail and we have added this to the reference list (reference 7).

Page 5, Line 90: Im not familiar with the term "peak agency" and the other explanations in this sentence do the job sufficiently I feel.

-Amended

Page 5, Line 103: The page number is listed here in the reference which is not in keeping with the rest of the referencing format.

-This is a direct quote for which the referencing style requires a page number.

Page 6: Two factors I liked about the approach taken were the direct email as well as the online approach, and the double-check of the websites 6 months later. This shows a good degree of rigor.

-No changes needed

Page 9: One aspect I would have liked to see more in the discussion is the quandry between having multiple sources of information (where there may be some overlap/disagreement), and having one overall source of information (which may be open to clinical or financial bias). In the current era I think it is unfeasible for there to be one sole source of information but the benefits of multiple information sources could be discussed more

-We do agree in that neither multiple nor one single source of resource development is ideal. However it is our view that a coordination of collaborative effort is necessary, as per the discussion. Our discussion holds that what is necessary is a comprehensive and coordinated approach - a consolidation of efforts and information by multiple organisations/researchers/sources.

-No changes have been made to the manuscript.

Page 9: Although the study was conducted in Australia, what are the implications of a wider scale? Could the results be extrapolated globally?

-Amended limitations to address this point by stating: "Whilst this study was conducted using a set of Australian organisations, we believe the issues raised are indicative of the nature of the development of sport and its concomitant safety issues in similar countries globally.

Page 10, Lines 195-197: Resources, staffing and mandate are all factors and motivation could also be included here. Why should organisations do this? Are there any motivations/penalties that could be used for this? (ie "carrot vs stick")

-Amended to include motivation in the list of factors. Whilst the questions around 'why' and 'how' this is necessary are indeed important, a discussion about the specific implementation drivers is outside the scope of this paper and so has not been added.

Page 10, Lines 200-505: This is a very lengthy and bulky sentence and should be reworded.

-Amended

Page 10, Line 210: I strongly agree that the end-user perspective is taken into account and hope that the authors can investigate this in the future using a similarly rigorous manner.

-No changes required

Page 10, Line 217: "Rivalry of resources" is a good way to summarise this situation.

-No changes required

Page 13, Lines 270-278: This paragraph reinforces the need for a co-ordinated approach, and I hope that following this series of studies that this will be able to occur.

-No changes required.

Page 15, Line 320: Correct abbreviation is "Am J Public Health"

-Amended

Page 17, Line 373: Correct abbreviation is "Am J Prev Med"

-Amended

Pages 22/23/24: There are no titles listed for any of the Figures but am not sure if this is an editing issue?

-Amended to include figure titles at the end of the document.

Page 22: I would remove the superscript numbers in the table as they are confusing to look at. A simpler way of showing the results would be to state "6 organisations", "285 resources", etc.

-Amended

Page 26/27: I also found it confusing to read through each section here as the hyperlinks were not put in brackets and it made it look awkward. Putting these into brackets would improve the appearance of it.

-Amended

Reviewer: 2

Reviewer Name: Jaime DeLuca

Institution and Country: Towson University, USA

Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None declared

Please leave your comments for the authors below

This manuscript is well-written, clear, and flows logically. Everything is explained well and there are lots of supporting documents and tables/figures included to enhance reader comprehension.

Authors state that the "quality" of the content in the NoGAPS documents was not assessed - which seems fair and appropriate to me - however I still feel as though the 'scope' component of the objective statement is not adequately covered in the article. The authors could provide more information regarding the content of the documents that is not specifically related to their quality. The results seem incredibly brief. Are there other dimensions of your findings that you might be able to report? In some ways, the tables and figures presented seem to be a stand-in for writing out some of the important results. The results did not convey an "in-depth qualitative document analysis approach" -- without some additional results and analysis, the research almost comes across as though you counted materials from websites. Please detail some of the qualitative findings from the thematic coding. Some additional items to cover might include the following:

-We agree that this study is descriptive, rather than in-depth and explanatory (amended by removing the word 'in-depth'). This study is a first step towards identifying the magnitude of the problem, and some of the issues related to this, especially as there continues to be development of ever-more resources without a concomitant consideration for the sheer scale of their accumulation and the implications thereof. We hope that this study provides the impetus for future research into content analysis and other aspects. See below for how we have addressed the specific suggestions.

What kind of responses did you get from the emails that you sent? (not related to which documents they sent - rather was there interest in this study? did they have any other comments? etc.)

-A summary of the email responses from the organisation representatives is included in Supplement 1. In the limitations section, we have already mentioned that there was consultation with, and recognition of, this research by the NoGAPS organisations.

Is there any content related to the "consultation" you had with the NoGAPS organizations, as mentioned in the limitations, that you might include?

-As stated above, a description of the content of these resources was beyond the scope of this paper. We intend to describe this in detail in a future paper.

Could the discussion section further analyze some of the specific results/findings you discovered in relation to the actual document content on each sport safety issue? Not the quality, but the content - what type of content was included? how robust was this information? Where was it synthesized from? Who developed the document? Were there pictures and diagrams? How complicated was the text? Was it accessible to the general public? Did the documents refer readers to additional resources?

-We agree that these are important questions but they are all beyond the scope of this present study. We intend to describe this in detail in a future paper.

Regarding the websites - were the documents easy to find? what is the traffic like to these websites - i.e.: who actually sees this stuff? how else is this information disseminated?

-A summary of the website and email search strategies is included in Supplement 1 which addresses how the documents were found. This also gives some information about the ways in which such information is generally disseminated by these organisations. With regards to the issue of website traffic and downloads of these documents, this will be an important consideration for future research.

#### VERSION 2 – REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Osman Hassan Ahmed Department of Physiotherapy, Poole Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Longfleet Road, Poole,
-----------------	---

	Dorset, United Kingdom.
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	14-Feb-2016

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	Many thanks for your consideration of the points that I raised in my initial review and for making the majority of the suggestions which I feel have strengthened the paper. I wish the authors well with their future projects and look forwards to following their work.
-------------------------	--

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Jaime DeLuca Towson University, USA
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	18-Feb-2016

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>I checked N/A above because my review of this draft is no different than the first draft -- the authors did very little to revise this paper. I appreciate their argument that my comments were beyond the scope of what they were writing about in this paper, however they indicate that the content I mentioned was earmarked for other publications - this means they have this information and have chosen not to include it here despite the fact that it would be helpful. I believe that addressing some of my earlier comments within this manuscript is important in order to make it a stronger, more comprehensive article, regardless of what they have planned for future publications. I have reiterated the comments I made on the first draft and the author's responses below. While I still contend that this was a clear, well-written manuscript, the authors needed to do more with this revision. In my opinion it is not enough to declare that all comments were beyond the scope of their study and use that to substantiate not revising this draft.</p> <p>My earlier comments, author comments, and my additional feedback:  Earlier comment: Authors state that the "quality" of the content in the NoGAPS documents was not assessed - which seems fair and appropriate to me - however I still feel as though the 'scope' component of the objective statement is not adequately covered in the article. The authors could provide more information regarding the content of the documents that is not specifically related to their quality. The results seem incredibly brief. Are there other dimensions of your findings that you might be able to report? In some ways, the tables and figures presented seem to be a stand-in for writing out some of the important results. The results did not convey an "in-depth qualitative document analysis approach" -- without some additional results and analysis, the research almost comes across as though you counted materials from websites. Please detail some of the qualitative findings from the thematic coding.</p> <p><b>AUTHORS REPLY:</b> We agree that this study is descriptive, rather than in-depth and explanatory (amended by removing the word 'in-depth').</p> <p><b>MY REPLY:</b> Removing a word does not change the intent of my earlier comment. These items, particularly in relation to the results, are still issues which were not addressed in this revision.</p> <p><b>AUTHORS REPLY:</b> This study is a first step towards identifying the magnitude of the problem, and some of the issues related to this,</p>
-------------------------	---

	<p>especially as there continues to be development of ever-more resources without a concomitant consideration for the sheer scale of their accumulation and the implications thereof. We hope that this study provides the impetus for future research into content analysis and other aspects.</p> <p>MY REPLY: This is likely true, but I still believe your paper needs more support and elaboration.</p> <p>MY EARLIER COMMENT: Is there any content related to the "consultation" you had with the NoGAPS organizations, as mentioned in the limitations, that you might include?</p> <p>AUTHORS REPLY: As stated above, a description of the content of these resources was beyond the scope of this paper. We intend to describe this in detail in a future paper.</p> <p>MY REPLY: I think the scope needs to be expanded as I believe this paper requires more robust information regardless of plans for future manuscripts.</p> <p>MY EARLIER COMMENT: Could the discussion section further analyze some of the specific results/findings you discovered in relation to the actual document content on each sport safety issue? Not the quality, but the content - what type of content was included? how robust was this information? Where was it synthesized from? Who developed the document? Were there pictures and diagrams? How complicated was the text? Was it accessible to the general public? Did the documents refer readers to additional resources?</p> <p>AUTHORS REPLY: We agree that these are important questions but they are all beyond the scope of this present study. We intend to describe this in detail in a future paper.</p> <p>MY REPLY: Again, I strongly believe that this paper needs to be expanded to attend to some of these questions regardless of what you may have planned for the future.</p>
--	--

### VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Reviewer Name: Osman Hassan Ahmed

Institution and Country: Department of Physiotherapy, Poole Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Longfleet Road, Poole, Dorset, UK

Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None declared

Please leave your comments for the authors below

Many thanks for your consideration of the points that I raised in my initial review and for making the majority of the suggestions which I feel have strengthened the paper. I wish the authors well with their future projects and look forwards to following their work.

24/03 AUTHORS' REPLY: Thank you, much appreciated.

Reviewer: 2

Reviewer Name: Jaime DeLuca



Institution and Country: Towson University, USA

Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None declared

Please leave your comments for the authors below

I checked N/A above because my review of this draft is no different than the first draft -- the authors did very little to revise this paper. I appreciate their argument that my comments were beyond the scope of what they were writing about in this paper, however they indicate that the content I mentioned was earmarked for other publications - this means they have this information and have chosen not to include it here despite the fact that it would be helpful. I believe that addressing some of my earlier comments within this manuscript is important in order to make it a stronger, more comprehensive article, regardless of what they have planned for future publications. I have reiterated the comments I made on the first draft and the author's responses below. While I still contend that this was a clear, well-written manuscript, the authors needed to do more with this revision. In my opinion it is not enough to declare that all comments were beyond the scope of their study and use that to substantiate not revising this draft.

24/03 AUTHORS' REPLY: Thank you for the clarification on your decision, it is much appreciated. See our specific responses below for how we have addressed this feedback.

My earlier comments, author comments, and my additional feedback:

Earlier comment: Authors state that the "quality" of the content in the NoGAPS documents was not assessed - which seems fair and appropriate to me - however I still feel as though the 'scope' component of the objective statement is not adequately covered in the article. The authors could provide more information regarding the content of the documents that is not specifically related to their quality. The results seem incredibly brief. Are there other dimensions of your findings that you might be able to report? In some ways, the tables and figures presented seem to be a stand-in for writing out some of the important results. The results did not convey an "in-depth qualitative document analysis approach" -- without some additional results and analysis, the research almost comes across as though you counted materials from websites. Please detail some of the qualitative findings from the thematic coding.

AUTHORS 1st REPLY: We agree that this study is descriptive, rather than in-depth and explanatory (amended by removing the word 'in-depth').

MY REPLY: Removing a word does not change the intent of my earlier comment. These items, particularly in relation to the results, are still issues which were not addressed in this revision.

24/03 AUTHORS' 2nd REPLY:

Our initial wording change was to ensure that the manuscript clearly stated that the study was descriptive in nature. We have carefully gone through the entire manuscript to ensure that the full intent and focus of the study is consistently represented across the whole text. See below for how we have addressed the comments in relation to the results.

AUTHORS 1st REPLY: This study is a first step towards identifying the magnitude of the problem, and some of the issues related to this, especially as there continues to be development of ever-more resources without a concomitant consideration for the sheer scale of their accumulation and the implications thereof. We hope that this study provides the impetus for future research into content analysis and other aspects.

MY REPLY: This is likely true, but I still believe your paper needs more support and elaboration.

24/03 AUTHORS' 2nd REPLY:

We have expanded the results section of the paper to more thoroughly describe the results shown in tables 1, 2, and 3.

We have also revised the text in the manuscript in several places to make it more explicitly clear that we did not undertake a content analysis of the catalogued resources – rather we only categorized the topic focus of the catalogue of documents. Our recommendation to conduct future research into the content development and quantity of these resources has also been expanded on in the discussion.

MY EARLIER COMMENT: Is there any content related to the "consultation" you had with the NoGAPS organizations, as mentioned in the limitations, that you might include?

AUTHORS 1st REPLY: As stated above, a description of the content of these resources was beyond the scope of this paper. We intend to describe this in detail in a future paper.

MY REPLY: I think the scope needs to be expanded as I believe this paper requires more robust information regardless of plans for future manuscripts.

24/03 AUTHORS' 2nd REPLY: We must admit an oversight here in that our original reply should have read: "As stated above, a description of the [development of the] content of these resources was beyond the scope of this paper. We intend to describe this in detail in a future paper". We have not undertaken a quality assessment or content analysis of these documents. We agree this would be valuable and have recommended this as an area for future research in the discussion.

Since this paper was initially submitted, we have had a paper describing the engagement with the NoGAPS organisations, including regular consultation and meetings throughout the project, accepted for publication in the journal Injury Prevention. This is now mentioned in the methods section of this manuscript and a reference provided.

We maintain that describing the processes used by the agencies to develop the resources we catalogued is beyond the scope of this paper. This paper presents as document analysis study design, and it is not possible to obtain that sort of information with this method. We agree that it is a very important issue, and so we have conducted follow-up work on that aspect. That research used a different study design and data collection approach (interviews) to answer a different research question, although linked to the same context (the NoGAPS organisations and their development and dissemination of sport safety resources). This is where we aim to answer some of your questions below re the documents themselves, such as "Where was it synthesized from? Who developed the document?" Therefore, whilst related, it would not be appropriate to report on that other study within this paper.

MY EARLIER COMMENT: Could the discussion section further analyze some of the specific results/findings you discovered in relation to the actual document content on each sport safety issue? Not the quality, but the content - what type of content was included? how robust was this information? Where was it synthesized from? Who developed the document? Were there pictures and diagrams? How complicated was the text? Was it accessible to the general public? Did the documents refer readers to additional resources?

AUTHORS 1st REPLY: We agree that these are important questions but they are all beyond the scope of this present study. We intend to describe this in detail in a future paper.

MY REPLY: Again, I strongly believe that this paper needs to be expanded to attend to some of these questions regardless of what you may have planned for the future.

AUTHORS 2nd REPLY: Please see our reply to the previous comment above.

**VERSION 3 - REVIEW**

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Jaime DeLuca Towson University, USA
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	07-Apr-2016

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	I am satisfied with the author's responses and changes in the text on this revision - thank you for your attention to detail and relevant clarifications.
-------------------------	---