

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/mhealth-23-13>

Review comments

The article describes improvements to and evaluation of the DOORS program (Digital Outreach for Obtaining Resources and Skills). This is a program that has been developed over the past 5 years to improve individuals' digital literacy skills. As part of this study, the authors sought to adapt the program to make it more accessible to more communities and then assess how participants responded to the changes as part of a pilot. Given disparities in digital literacy and lack of appropriate solutions, the work is both highly significant and timely. I am overall very impressed with the program and the work of the researchers; however, the paper needs much more detailed description of the methods and results in order to evaluate its scientific rigor and reproducibility. Most notably, there is a lack of clarity on the measurement tool used to assess the program; without this clarity, it's at present difficult to interpret the results.

1. First, if improving the program was one of the main objectives of the study, the paper should include more detail in the methods about how this was done. There is currently only one sentence (page 6, Line 107) that generally states the process involved feedback from end users, clinicians, and partnerships. More details around who these individuals were/their familiarity with the program, how the feedback was elicited/collected and over what span of time, etc. would help strengthen the reader's understanding of this process.

Reply 1: This reviewer makes a thoughtful suggestion and we have added these details to the manuscript.

Changes in the text 1: Starting from page 6, Line 110 and ending on page 7, Line 117, we have included information about the timeline of the feedback, individuals' familiarity with the program, and how the feedback was collected.

2. More detail is also needed on the procedure for assessing the program.

a. How were participants recruited? Were there any eligibility criteria?

Reply 2a: This reviewer raises a good point. We have added this information to the manuscript.

Changes in the text 2a: Recruitment information and eligibility criteria are provided on page 7, Lines 124- 127 and lines 129-131.

b. The only information reported on the participants was that their ages ranged from 25-71. The results should include more information on these participants' characteristics to help inform generalizability of the findings.

Reply 2b: Since DOORS was conducted as a community program, the research team did not have access to participants' medical records nor treatment history. In addition, the research team administered the surveys to assess immediate retention of digital skills and improve the DOORS program. No personal health information was collected as PHI was

not deemed relevant to the survey's main goal (i.e. improving DOORs program) and participants expressed more comfort completing the surveys if they maintained their anonymity. We do agree that this is a limitation as more detailed demographic information could aid the generalizability of the findings. To mitigate this limitation, we have added some additional information about our participants to the manuscript.

Changes in the text 2b: We have added more information about our participants on page 7, lines 122-123.

c. Page 7, Line 117 states "Session attendance ranged between ten to nineteen participants in total across both sites." Sentence is unclear – Is it that between ten to nineteen participants attended each of the sessions across both sites? To provide a better sense of engagement, consider reporting the percent who attended most sessions (e.g., of those who signed up, what percent attend at least 5 or 6 sessions?).

Reply 2c: In response to 2a, we have added recruitment and eligibility information to the manuscript. Specifically, we have added that DOORs was run as an optional, community service program. Participants did not register nor were mandated to attend all 8 sessions. Due to this, reporting how many participants attended most of the sessions would not accurately reflect engagement with the program. Rather, when analyzing the data, the research team views session independently. Thus, we feel that reporting engagement for each session is a better indicator. We have provided the percentage of participants who engaged in the full session for the session with the highest attendance and the session with the lowest attendance (i.e. how many participants were present for the entire session defined as the percentage of those who a survey at the beginning and end of the session).

Changes in the text 2c: We have added more engagement information about our participants on page 8, Lines 139-143.

d. Page 7, Line 118 states "Participants were given the survey at the beginning of each session and at the conclusion of the session." Based on this and other information, I am assuming the survey was different across each session? Does this mean there were 8 versions of the survey? Were the items in each survey always different? More detail is needed on the measurement tool used to assess digital literacy in general – how many items were included on the survey? What were the response options? How were the items scored? Based on the structure for the surveys, there are many implications for the analyses/results, but this is difficult to critique without this clarity.

Reply 2d: This reviewer raises a good point and we thank them for the guidance. We have added much more information about the survey to the manuscript.

Changes in the text 2d: We have added information about the survey's content, response options, and number of skills assessed to Section 2.3 Measurement Tools. In response to this comment and comment 2f, we have added Section 2.5 Statistical Analysis to the methods and detail how the surveys were scored.

e. Rather than state the interview guide can be requested from the author, this should be included with the other supplementary materials.

Reply 2e: The interview guide is now included in the supplementary material.

Changes in the text 2e: Page 10 Line 203 has been changed to reflect this addition.

f. Some of the information on the analyses is reported in the results, but this is better suited in the methods under an analysis section. This is the first place where there is reference to the types and number of digital skills assessed as part of the survey – consider reporting in table in methods to help respond to comment 2.d. above.

Reply 2f: In conjunction with comment 2d, we thank this reviewer for this suggestion and have added another section to our methods to include this information.

Changes in the text 2d: In response to this comment and comment 2d, we have added Section 2.5 Statistical Analysis to the methods, moved the information mentioned in this comment from the results to Section 2.5, and detail how the surveys were scored.

3. In the Intro, Methods, and Discussion, the authors discuss the limited available scales to assess digital literacy; however, there are a few which should be acknowledged and compared/contrasted with their tool.

<https://www.jmir.org/2017/1/e27/authors>

<https://formative.jmir.org/2022/4/e36043/>

Reply 3: We agree with this reviewer and think it is important to compare and contrast our measurement tools with those that have been developed by other research teams. These two articles were already cited in our paper as citations 28 and 29. These citations are mentioned in the Introduction page 5 Lines 84-86 and Methods page 9 Line 178. We have added more direct comparisons to this manuscript due to this comment.

Changes in the text 3: In the Discussion Section 4.2 Strengths and Limitations, page 17 starting on line 367, we have added a more direct comparison between our measurement tools and the ones cited above.

4. The “implementation of a single-site intervention model” was difficult to understand – is this essentially what is used when the 8-week model is not feasible? Why is it called single-site? Could it be replaced with a more intuitive name?

Reply 4: Yes, this reviewer is correct! When an 8-week model is not feasible, we offer a single intervention that can be repeated each week with a new group of participants. We have changed the name to “single-session intervention model” to clarify this.

Changes in the text 4: Any mention of “single-site intervention model” has been changed to “single-session intervention model,” including on page 2, Lines 27; page 11, Lines 227; and page 12, Lines 260.