Reviewer Comments-1

Introduction

- Clearly written. May want to add a statement or two about the need to prevent suicide (are they on the rise?), dispelling myths, etc. to make rationale for the podcast stronger.

Formation of the Podcast Title

- Please explain or describe what Google Jamboard is. Given that this is a process evaluation and a "how to" in some ways, that would be helpful information for other academics interested in developing a podcast.

Literature Review

- Clearly written. However, I do not think the A, B, C in subheadings is APA format. Check journal standards.
- The last sentence "The current paper seeks to present the findings from the Brain Hijack podcast episodes to the public with the intent to expand awareness of suicide prevention." – are you sure this is the purpose? This makes it sound like the purpose of this article is to inform about podcast topics. Are you not also evaluating by describing the reach? Are you also assessing effectiveness too? (Ok if not. What I am trying to say is make the purpose clear).

Materials and Methods

- It is clear how the podcast was reviewed for quality. However, this wouldn't be "Methods" as typically understood in research. This is still about developing and disseminating the podcast.

Results & Discussion

- Okay. Now I think I understand what is happening and the reason for confusion. It seems like you (and the research team) are evaluating this podcast for quality (e.g., content aligns with CDC's recommendations) and its reach (how many people listened, etc. If I am correct, then you need to re-organize this paper and make above purpose clear. See my suggestion below.

Introduction

Literature Review

- End with Research Purpose or Research Question (and why BrainHijacks was selected for analysis)
  BrainHijacks: About the Podcast (so, describe the podcast here for context)
- Developing the title
- Producing content & quality review
- When podcast went live; how many episodes produced thus far
- *Were you part of developing the podcast? If so, that should be clear.*

Methods

- Discuss that you all used 6 episodes for analysis
  - Why just the 6? Were those the only ones available? Could by why they did not cover the 6th pillar per CDC recommendations
- Discuss how data was analyzed (seems like content analysis)
- Discuss the framework for analysis: CDC's Pillars for content, dispelling myths, and holistic approach (is what I gather)
- Discuss how you obtained "reach" (publically available?)

Results

- Integrate your discussion findings with each figure. Just makes more sense.
- Keep focus on the extent to which content aligns with your framework (e.g., content, dispelling myths, and holistic approach).
- I do not see why figure 5 (e.g., the name) is relevant.

Discussion

- Keep this high-level; Main ideas
- Discuss limits to this study/evaluation
- Recommendations for practice/research