Reviewer comment-1

Thank you for the opportunity to review this unique and timely manuscript. I genuinely hope my feedback is respectful and can be used to improve this article. Anything with a (+) is a positive, and anything with a (*) indicates an area of growth/revision. (+) The introduction was so well structured and written that I could clearly follow your argument and how you got there. The writing style is both academic and approachable, which is extremely difficult. (-) While I applaud the clarity of the introduction, it needs to be more developed as a literature review. We jump to understanding the TIDE method, but we have no context or grounding in multi-media and HIV now. To better contextualize your impact and results, it may be advantageous to indicate and outline the intersection of HIV and multimedia research. Without it, the reader/audience does not have the opportunity to understand how/why your analysis and results are unique compared to other research. You rightfully state that there is a paucity of research, and I agree, but you do not summarize that research. ^^ This is especially true considering you lean into the art and power of narrative storytelling, which has a long history in HIV advocacy. Please connect the dots for the reader. (-) Likewise, around line 75, you present a RQ that mentions "structural challenges attributed to social and societal factors" but the literature review did not disclose or document these structural challenges and/or societal factors. I would go back to the lit review and specifically add a subsection addressing this. The digital divide and technological access seems essential to the study, but it is absent from the lit review. (-) Also, I am not sure who "we" is referring to in the RQ- HIV advocates public health, the authors? (-) Similar to above, you repeatedly mention a "film-based intervention," but a film-based intervention about what? Stigma? Education? Treatment? PrEP? Methods: (-) Your questions concern their experience watching the video, but your RQ concerns how you can mitigate structural barriers. Please explain how/why these questions connect to RQ; I think the goal was to use these questions to quantify if/how barriers exist, but you have to make that clear for us. (-) Hmmm, respectfully, I believe there may be a disconnect in this article. The lit review and intro are about disparity and COVID-19 overall, but the findings seem to be about a unique, intentional and community informed recruitment strategy. I whole heartedly find the analysis and takeaway important and insightful, but it does not follow the argument at the beginning. In my opinion, if you want to show the impact of a different implementation strategy, the intro and lit review should be about the lack of community-informed approaches now. I would also strongly recommend looking into Dutta's Culture Centred Approach (CCA) because he would call what you're doing creating "infrastructures of listening." This would also give you a theoretical framing that helps justify this approach and study. Some may be vehemently opposed to the manuscript not mentioning a theory or approach at all. overall, I believe with a major revision, this study is worthy of publication because it highlights a unique form of community engaged research that was flexible and impactful. However, right now, the lit

review and sections leading up to findings do not fully develop the argument and the argument shifts throughout the article.