

## PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form ([see an example](#)) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below. Some articles will have been accepted based in part or entirely on reviews undertaken for other BMJ Group journals. These will be reproduced where possible.

### ARTICLE DETAILS

<b>TITLE (PROVISIONAL)</b>	How might the London 2012 Olympics influence health and the determinants of health? Local newspaper analysis of pre-games pathways and impacts.
<b>AUTHORS</b>	Bourke, Liam; Selvanayagam, Marinie; Thompson, Claire; Taylor, Stephanie; Cummins, Steven

### VERSION 1 - REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Dr. Louise Mansfield Deputy Director Brunel Centre for Sport, Health and Well Being, Brunel University, Uxbridge, UB8 3PH.
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	31-Jul-2012

<b>THE STUDY</b>	<p>The use of linear regression may well be appropriate but there isn't enough information in the section on data analysis for me to make a full judgement. More information would be needed for there to be a clear element of repeatability in this statistical analysis. I would expect, for example, there to be a comment on what type of measures / variables reporting of employment, physical activity for health and well being and time/frequency are. The statistical analysis rather disappears completely from the discussion. Perhaps there could be a more balanced approach to the quantitative and qualitative elements of this study.</p>
<b>RESULTS &amp; CONCLUSIONS</b>	<p>It would support the methods in this paper if a clear comment on total number of articles in the sample and numbers included and excluded were stated in the text - say on page 6.</p> <p>The steps in the thematic framework are noted and primary themes listed but the sub-themes that might be expected in this type of coding process are not detailed. It might help the coherence of the paper to provide a clearer definition / outline of each theme because as the discussion progresses it becomes clear that employment, physical activity and health are being thought of in quite a nuanced way. For example, employment is not being explored simply in terms of paid work.</p> <p>In some places the media quotes seem misplaced. So, for example in the section on 'overall well being' I was wondering why a volunteering quote was included? It may well be relevant but because there is a lack of detail about how the themes have been defined it is not entirely clear. Perhaps it is worth reviewing all the quotes to ensure they speak directly to the theme under scrutiny.</p> <p>On page 12 line 3 the word 'with' needs to be inserted after the work 'conjunction'</p> <p>On page 12 from line 9 I wonder whether the commentary on discourse analysis requires, perhaps, some further consideration.</p>

	<p>There is much debate about the ability to sharply divide discourse analysis from content analysis and the justification for this provided on pages 11 and 12 may appear a little superficial (with respect to the literature on the subject). Is this method really content analysis without any discourse analysis? In adopting the thematic approach argued for in this paper there seems to me at least a degree of both categorisation and interpretation. While I agree that the paper does not go so far as to include a detailed interpretation of the meaning of the texts under analysis it has gone some way to unpacking the discourse by categorising the themes (in table 2) and then selecting (by interpretation) quotations that represent that discourse. I would say that while I agree with the sentiment of a need for analysis of latent content of media texts this paper has identified and explored a pattern of representation of health and therefore aspects of content analysis and discourse analysis overlap. Furthermore, it is not discourse analysis per se that will lead to an examination of adverse effects. Indeed, the approach in this paper has already identified negative aspects of the employment theme for example. I wonder if the commentary should recognise these complexities.</p>
<b>REPORTING &amp; ETHICS</b>	<p>Questions 1 and 2 in the review sheet on reporting and ethics do not appear relevant to this paper</p>
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>I think this is a timely and interesting study. I think it has the potential to be published.</p>

<b>REVIEWER</b>	<p>Dr Richard Shipway Associate Dean: International Engagement School of Tourism Bournemouth University Talbot Campus Poole Dorset BH12 5BB, UK</p>
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	<p>17-Aug-2012</p>

<b>THE STUDY</b>	<p>I feel that the author(s) need to better explain the link between health and employability. Fro the non-expert, it reads as quite disjointed. When i first started reading it, I was unsure whether the manuscript is looking at 'health', or 'employability', or a combination of both. In summary, it's quite confusing in terms of how the links are explained between the 2 areas. The title of the paper talks about health and health determinants, but i'm not sure the non expert will understand how and where 'employability' impacts upon this (struggling to make the connection between them). As such, it's confusing that the 'key messages' don't seem to fit with the title of the paper.</p> <p>I find that page 4 is just a very bland and general overview of the Olympic bid etc. It adds nothing but descriptive context.</p> <p>Most of my comments will really focus on the results and discussions and the methodology adopted.</p>
<b>RESULTS &amp; CONCLUSIONS</b>	<p>This seems to provide a very small snapshot of a large area of investigation, and after reading it....whilst I can see it's an important area of study, i'm not convinced what this piece of work really adds to the literature.</p> <p>This is where I really struggle at the start of the methods section. The author (s) determine the direction of the article and the</p>

	<p>emergent research themes by dictating the key terms that they use in the search terms. They insert and search by the words health, wellbeing and employ.....and then, surprise, surprise these are the key themes that emerge in the results? It seems far too pre-determined and conceived. This becomes clear when the first 'key theme' is employment, which is one of those search terms.</p> <p>I find the whole results section to be providing some really interesting rich data, however it all reads as a very basic overview from a small snapshot of 2 local newspapers, and i'm unconvinced that this is enough to claim as key determinants of health, especially when the authors dictated those themes by the key words they were searching through.</p> <p>I found the discussion to be OK but quite superficial when compared to other recent studies by the likes of Mike Weed. The also (page 12) tend to drift away from health into more general areas.</p> <p>I found the conclusions to be quite weak, and in need of further development. At the very end the author(s) mention social impact assessments and also include this in the abstract, but the conclusion is the first time when this large area is really introduced?</p> <p>In summary, I found this a very interesting read, but I have major reservations about the way the determinants were determined, and also how this then impacts on the results. For me, this is quite fundamental.</p>
<b>REPORTING &amp; ETHICS</b>	I have no issues with this section

### VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: Dr. Louise Mansfield, Deputy Director Brunel Centre for Sport, Health and Well Being, Brunel University, Uxbridge

Comment 1: The use of linear regression may well be appropriate but there isn't enough information in the section on data analysis for me to make a full judgement. More information would be needed for there to be a clear element of repeatability in this statistical analysis. I would expect, for example, there to be a comment on what type of measures / variables reporting of employment, physical activity for health and well being and time/frequency are.

Response 1: Thank you for highlighting this issue, we agree that there could be more detail added to the data analysis section and have consulted Dr Miland Joshi, a statistician here at Queen Mary University of London, on how to improve this section (Dr Joshi's assistance is now noted in the acknowledgments section). The purpose of the quantitative analysis was not to scrutinise data or figures on new employment opportunities or physical activity or wellbeing outcomes but rather assess trends in the number of instances that these determinants of health were mentioned in the articles carried in Newham Recorder or the East London Advertiser. To do this we used linear regression techniques that have been employed previously to interpret frequencies generated in media analysis studies. (Alkhateeb and Lawrentschuk, 2011) Frequencies were generated by assessing when an article reported on issues relating to employment, physical activity or overall wellbeing and were linked to the 2012 Olympics e.g. investment and new jobs brought to Newham directly as a result of the Games (employment), sports events directly inspired by the Games (physical activity) or investment in health infrastructure as a result of the Games (overall wellbeing). These frequencies were then reported per calendar month to assess trends over time. This information has now been added to the data analysis section of the manuscript.

Comment 2: The statistical analysis rather disappears completely from the discussion. Perhaps there could be a more balanced approach to the quantitative and qualitative elements of this study.

Response 2: We felt that the qualitative data should be the focus of the discussion due to its rich descriptive data. However, we agree that directly referencing the quantitative results would have improved the manuscript by giving context to the qualitative findings in the discussion. We have now added the following phrases in the discussion:

- “Despite a significant trend in increasing numbers of articles reporting on employment issues related to the Games” in paragraph 3 of the discussion.
- “Our results show that although local newspaper coverage on promotion of physical activity did not significantly increase over time, there were a large proportion of articles related to promoting physical activity in young people” in paragraph 4 of the discussion.
- “Reporting of pathways to increasing overall wellbeing significantly increased over time although (because of the multifaceted nature of “wellbeing”) they were intuitively heterogeneous” in paragraph 5 of the discussion.

Comment 3: It would support the methods in this paper if a clear comment on total number of articles in the sample and numbers included and excluded were stated in the text - say on page 6.

Response 3: We have reported the numbers of articles in the sample and also how many were included and excluded in Figure 1 which is referenced in the results section. Inclusion and exclusion of articles are usually stated in the results section rather than methods sections in media analysis reports. (Hilton et al., 2010, Hilton et al., 2009) We have now included these figures in the results section to aid readability of the manuscript.

Comment 4: The steps in the thematic framework are noted and primary themes listed but the sub-themes that might be expected in this type of coding process are not detailed. It might help the coherence of the paper to provide a clearer definition / outline of each theme because as the discussion progresses it becomes clear that employment, physical activity and health are being thought of in quite a nuanced way. For example, employment is not being explored simply in terms of paid work.

Response 4: On reflection, we agree that our methods could have been described more clearly and agree that we should have included definitions for employment, physical activity and overall wellbeing. We have also expanded the description of the themes in Table 2 as directed. This is an oversight and we thank the reviewer for highlighting this. We have now included these details in the text of the methods:

- Employment: coverage of how the Games could impact the generation of new paid employment, assistance to find employment, the provision of work experience opportunities or commercial success that could lead directly to the provision of new employment positions.
- Physical activity: stories related to how the Games might impact sporting or exercise behaviour in members of the local community.
- Overall wellbeing: coverage of how the Games impacts members of the community in terms of being healthy, happy, or prosperous and not related to physical activity or employment.

Comment 5: In some places the media quotes seem misplaced. So, for example in the section on 'wellbeing' I was wondering why a volunteering quote was included? It may well be relevant but because there is a lack of detail about how the themes have been defined it is not entirely clear. Perhaps it is worth reviewing all the quotes to ensure they speak directly to the theme under scrutiny.

Response 5: We did very carefully consider which example quotes to include in the manuscript.

Regarding “wellbeing”, we recognise that there are potentially many factors that contribute and have noted this in the discussion. Although, as there are aspects of volunteering involved in each theme, in order to aid readability of the manuscript we have removed the 1st quote from this section of the results.

Comment 6: On page 12 line 3 the word 'with' needs to be inserted after the word 'conjunction'

Response 6: Thank you for pointing this out, the typographical error has now been corrected.

Comment 7: On page 12 from line 9 I wonder whether the commentary on discourse analysis requires, perhaps, some further consideration. There is much debate about the ability to sharply divide discourse analysis from content analysis and the justification for this provided on pages 11 and 12 may appear a little superficial (with respect to the literature on the subject). Is this method really content analysis without any discourse analysis? In adopting the thematic approach argued for in this paper there seems to me at least a degree of both categorisation and interpretation. While I agree that the paper does not go so far as to include a detailed interpretation of the meaning of the texts under analysis it has gone some way to unpacking the discourse by categorising the themes (in table 2) and then selecting (by interpretation) quotations that represent that discourse. I would say that while I agree with the sentiment of a need for analysis of latent content of media texts this paper has identified and explored a pattern of representation of health and therefore aspects of content analysis and discourse analysis overlap. Furthermore, it is not discourse analysis per se that will lead to an examination of adverse effects. Indeed, the approach in this paper has already identified negative aspects of the employment theme for example. I wonder if the commentary should recognise these complexities.

Response 7: Thank you for bringing this to our attention. We agree this is a complex area with some overlapping elements to it. A framework analysis has been used in the present study because of its suitability for exploring issues of policy and also because the prime concern of this approach is to describe and interpret what is happening in a particular setting.(Ritchie and Spencer, 1994) However, one possible way of more comprehensively addressing the broader societal and political context of these news stories, and the issues of interest that may have shaped their content, would be to undertake an explicitly discourse analytical approach. Discourse Analysis serves as an umbrella term for traditions that operate under postmodern and poststructuralist assumptions but originate from different theoretical standpoints and utilise different types of data .(Wetherell, 2001 ) Discourse analysis cannot be pinned down to a specific theory and method because it encompasses a range of interlocking and overlapping traditions. Where a framework analysis could be considered at the more descriptive end of the spectrum of discourse approaches, a more discursive analysis could aim to uncover ideological assumptions, perspectives and social processes within texts. This necessitates looking at what is not mentioned as much as what is. Such an approach would, therefore, examine why potential adverse effects, such as sex trafficking, have received less attention from the local press and how this may be linked to broader concerns of representation and power. However to due to limitations of time and resource such an approach was beyond the scope of the current study. To recognise these complexities we have expended this passage in the discussion to read “A framework analysis has been used here because of its suitability for exploring issues of policy and also because the prime concern of this approach is to describe and interpret what is happening in a particular setting.(Ritchie and Spencer, 1994) However, an avenue for future enquiry aiming to investigate the broader societal and political context of these news stories, and the issues of interest that may have shaped their content, would be to undertake an explicitly discourse analytical approach. However to due to limitations of time and resource such an approach was beyond the scope of the current study.”

Comment 8: Questions 1 and 2 in the review sheet on reporting and ethics do not appear relevant to

this paper I think this is a timely and interesting study. I think it has the potential to be published.

Reviewer: Dr Richard Shipway, Associate Dean: International Engagement School of Tourism  
Bournemouth University Talbot Campus Poole Dorset.

Comment 1: I feel that the author(s) need to better explain the link between health and employability. For the non-expert, it reads as quite disjointed. When I first started reading it, I was unsure whether the manuscript is looking at 'health', or 'employability', or a combination of both. In summary, it's quite confusing in terms of how the links are explained between the 2 areas. The title of the paper talks about health and health determinants, but I'm not sure the non expert will understand how and where 'employability' impacts upon this (struggling to make the connection between them). As such, it's confusing that the 'key messages' don't seem to fit with the title of the paper.

Response 1: There is a well-established literature base associating employment as a key determinant of health. (Wellings et al., 2011, Meegan and Mitchell, 2001, Marmot, 2010, McCartney et al., 2010) Furthermore, employment was identified as the main legacy associated with the Olympics by local authority stakeholders in a consultation conducted by Professor Cummins in January 2008. As such, we judged this was an important area of investigation which should be included in this analysis.

Comment 2: I find that page 4 is just a very bland and general overview of the Olympic bid etc. It adds nothing but descriptive context.

Response 2: In the opening part of our research manuscript we have described the background to the work, explained the context of the research and generated a rationale for the study with a stated aim. We have done this by explaining the problems facing Newham as an area and how urban regeneration could work, giving a brief synopsis of the research evidence around regeneration of sporting "mega events" and finally described a clear and realistic aim for the project in the context of the London 2012 Olympic Games. We have cited relevant evidence where appropriate to substantiate our assertions and would finally note that such misgivings were not highlighted by reviewer # 1.

Comment 3: Most of my comments will really focus on the results and discussions and the methodology adopted. This seems to provide a very small snapshot of a large area of investigation, and after reading it....whilst I can see it's an important area of study, i'm not convinced what this piece of work really adds to the literature.

Response 3: We agree with the reviewer that evaluating the health legacy for the 2012 Olympic Games is a very large and complex area of investigation. Undoubtedly, this study is unlikely to singularly form the basis for such a broad ranging evaluation. However, we believe that public health research is an iterative process (Green, 2009) and view this manuscript as one contributing part of an overall larger evidence base. Newspaper and media analyses have been conducted to evaluate perceptions about other areas of health research and have successfully contributed to the knowledge base and understanding through citation in subsequent work. (Hilton et al., 2009, Hilton et al., 2010) We do feel strongly that understanding the issues which are specific to the local community by conducting an analysis of local newspaper content is a unique and useful insight into understanding the pathways of impact on health brought about by the Games. Verily, this manuscript was described by reviewer 1 as a "timely and interesting study". Furthermore, as this is the only study we are aware of that has conducted such an analysis of pre-Games pathways and impacts on determinants of health, we feel this novel work has a good potential to contribute to the literature base.

Comment 4: This is where I really struggle at the start of the methods section. The author (s) determine the direction of the article and the emergent research themes by dictating the key terms

that they use in the search terms. They insert and search by the words health, wellbeing and employ.....and then, surprise, surprise these are the key themes that emerge in the results? It seems far too pre- determined and conceived. This becomes clear when the first 'key theme' is employment, which is one of those search terms.

Response 4: We thank the reviewer for highlighting that this could have been better described. As we have commented in the manuscript, understanding how these pre-defined pathways of impact are described and understood, with an assessment of which are deemed to be the most important to local media/community, and what if any, translate to impacts on health and health inequalities is crucial.(Fuller, 1996)

We will also expand the following information in the methods section: "We focused on three legacy outcomes. First, physical activity which, through the motto 'inspire a generation', has been proposed as a key legacy of London 2012.(Department for Culture Media and Sport, 2008, Department of Health, 2010) Second, employment has been identified as the main legacy associated with the Olympics by local authority stakeholders. Third, improvements in wellbeing a current national policy goal promoted by the current government.(Cameron, 2010) These outcomes are also consistent with the health-related legacy objectives highlighted by the Olympic Park Legacy Company(Greater London Authority, 2011) and have a well-established evidence base as key social and behavioural determinants of physical and psychological health. (Wellings et al., 2011, Meegan and Mitchell, 2001, Marmot, 2010, McCartney et al., 2010, Weed et al., 2012, Department of Health Physical Activity Health Improvement and Protection, 2011)"

Comment 5: I find the whole results section to be providing some really interesting rich data, however it all reads as a very basic overview from a small snapshot of 2 local newspapers, and I'm unconvinced that this is enough to claim as key determinants of health, especially when the authors dictated those themes by the key words they were searching through.

Response 5: We judged these three variables as key determinants of health according to a well-established evidence base. (Wellings et al., 2011, Meegan and Mitchell, 2001, Marmot, 2010, McCartney et al., 2010, Weed et al., 2012, Department of Health Physical Activity Health Improvement and Protection, 2011) We have now added these key citations to the manuscript methods to validate the premise for addressing these areas specifically.

The Newham recorder and the East London Advertiser are the only two local print papers circulated to the residents of Newham and have a distribution of over 35,000 homes. We screened over 1400 articles of this study and the results are based on over 350 pieces of work. This volume of source material is analogous to other published, peer-reviewed media analysis research.(Hilton et al., 2010)

Comment 6: I found the discussion to be OK but quite superficial when compared to other recent studies by the likes of Mike Weed. The also (page 12) tend to drift away from health into more general areas. I found the conclusions to be quite weak, and in need of further development. At the very end the author(s) mention social impact assessments and also include this in the abstract, but the conclusion is the first time when this large area is really introduced?

Response 6: Thank you for pointing out that including social impact assessment in the conclusion appears slightly out of flow with the rest of the manuscript. We have now removed this statement.

Thank you for highlighting Professor Weed's recent systematic review of a physical activity legacy from the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games.(Weed et al., 2012) We do feel however, that comparison is not necessarily appropriate as it is a fundamentally different type of research endeavour to the present study. Given that particular systematic review synthesises evidence from 24 separate sources it would follow that the discussion has more depth and scope to be assertive. Whilst constructing our discussion (as stated in paragraph 2), we felt it appropriate to be careful not to

overextend our conclusions as data from media sources should be judged in the context of relevant biases, limitations and potential lack of objectivity in reporting. We feel that it was appropriate to highlight that the evidence presented in this analysis of local newspaper reports should be judged in context of an "Evaluation of the tangible impacts on population health, and the determinants of health and health inequalities, of the London 2012 Olympics is required in order to unpack whether there is truly a lasting legacy for East London." This passage has now been added to the conclusion.

We look forward to hearing the editor's perspective on the amendments.

With kind regards,

Dr Liam Bourke

#### References

- ALKHATEEB, S. & LAWRENTSCHUK, N. 2011. Consumerism and its impact on robotic-assisted radical prostatectomy. *BJU Int*, 108, 1874-8.
- CAMERON, D. (2010) <http://www.number10.gov.uk/news/pm-speech-on-well-being/> [Online].
- DEPARTMENT FOR CULTURE MEDIA AND SPORT. 2008. Before, during and after. Making the most of the London 2012 Games [Online]. Available: [www.culture.gov.uk/reference\\_library/publications/5161.aspx/](http://www.culture.gov.uk/reference_library/publications/5161.aspx/).
- DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH. 2010. On the state of public health: annual report of the chief medical officer 2009 [Online]. Available: [http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Publicationsandstatistics/Publications/AnnualReports/DH\\_113912](http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Publicationsandstatistics/Publications/AnnualReports/DH_113912).
- DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH PHYSICAL ACTIVITY HEALTH IMPROVEMENT AND PROTECTION 2011. Start Active, Stay Active: A report on physical activity from the four home countries' Chief Medical Officers.
- FULLER, J. 1996. *News Values: Ideas for an Information Age*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.
- GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY 2011. Olympic Park Legacy Corporation: Proposals by the Mayor of London for public consultation. <http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/oplc-mayor-proposals.pdf>.
- GREEN, L. W., OTTOSON, J, GARCIA, C AND ROBERT, H. 2009. Diffusion Theory and Knowledge Dissemination, Utilization, and Integration in Public Health (2009). *Annual Review of Public Health*, 30, 151.
- HILTON, S., HUNT, K., LANGAN, M., BEDFORD, H. & PETTICREW, M. 2010. Newsprint media representations of the introduction of the HPV vaccination programme for cervical cancer prevention in the UK (2005-2008). *Social science & medicine*, 70, 942-50.
- HILTON, S., HUNT, K., LANGAN, M., HAMILTON, V. & PETTICREW, M. 2009. Reporting of MMR evidence in professional publications: 1988-2007. *Arch Dis Child*, 94, 831-3.
- MARMOT, M. 2010. *Fair Society, Healthy Lives. Strategic Review of Health Inequalities in England Post 2010*. London.
- MCCARTNEY, G., THOMAS, S., THOMSON, H., SCOTT, J., HAMILTON, V., HANLON, P., MORRISON, D. S. & BOND, L. 2010. The health and socioeconomic impacts of major multi-sport events: systematic review (1978-2008). *BMJ*, 340, c2369.
- MEEGAN, R. & MITCHELL, A. 2001. 'It's Not Community Round Here, It's Neighbourhood': Neighbourhood Change and Cohesion in Urban Regeneration. *Urban Studies*, 38, 2167-2194.
- RITCHIE, J. & SPENCER, L. 1994. *Qualitative data analysis for applied policy research.*, London, Routledge.
- WEED, M., COREN, E., FIORE, J., WELLARD, I., MANSFIELD, L., CHATZIEFSTATHIOU, D. & DOWSE, S. 2012. Developing a physical activity legacy from the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games: a policy-led systematic review. *Perspect Public Health*, 132, 75-80.
- WELLINGS, K., DATTA, J., WILKINSON, P. & PETTICREW, M. 2011. The 2012 Olympics: assessing the public health effect. *Lancet*, 378, 1193-5.



WETHERELL, M., TAYLOR, S AND YATES, S 2001 Discourse as Data: a guide for analysis, London Sage Publications Ltd in association with the Open University Press.

### VERSION 2 – REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Dr. Louise Mansfield Deputy Director, Brunel Centre for Sport, Health and Well Being School of Sport and Education Brunel University Kingston Lane Uxbridge UB8 3PH
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	24-Sep-2012

<b>REPORTING &amp; ETHICS</b>	Questions 1 and 2 in the 'Reporting and Ethics' section do not appear to be relevant to this paper.
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>I would like to thank the authors for their serious and thoughtful responses to earlier comments. The revised manuscript is both clearer and more coherent at the points noted previously. I have one or two more minor points to make but I do feel they are important reflections if this paper is to be published in BMJ Open.</p> <p>1. Could the authors clarify the numbers stated in Figure 1 (The Flow Diagram of Results) if this figure is going to be included in the revised paper. The total number meeting the inclusion criteria is stated as 351. The total is divided into 3 'themes' as follows: employment (131); physical activity (116); and wellbeing (121). I make those 3 thematic counts total 368. Can you comment?</p> <p>2. Could there be a little more transparency on the frequency counts in the text or /and cross references to Table 2 (if relevant). I think readers would benefit from knowing in the text what the frequency count numbers were and more crucially the value of the claimed increases in frequency of articles introduced in the first paragraph of the results section on page 8. Frequency and increases in frequency seem to be a key part of your quantitative work. This, for me, is a straightforward inclusion of your numbers in the text.</p> <p>3. This is a very minor point but I was wondering if there needs to be consistency in the way that the numbers of articles in each theme are referred to from page 8 - so as to avoid any confusion. For example sometimes the phrasing refers to a number of articles included a particular theme as in '162 of 351 articles covered this pathway' (p.8) and sometimes the phrasing refers to the number of times a theme is read as in 'mentioned 131 times out of 351 total articles' (p. 8). In terms of the research approach I am not convinced that these phrases mean the same thing.</p>

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Dr Richard Shipway Associate Dean: International Engagement Bournemouth University, UK
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	02-Oct-2012

<b>THE STUDY</b>	I still have reservations about this paper and the sample (maybe that's my own personal bias, so i don't want to undermine colleagues work here and have tried to remain open minded). Unfortunately, the revised version does not answer those previous concerns. I do not
------------------	---

	<p>notice too much different about this revised submission, and whilst it reads adequately, to me it is a very generic snapshot of a small community (which isn't a problem in itself, but is only scratching the surface of the issues in a very superficial and localised way). The editor will have to choose whether that makes a contribution to knowledge here - I am still sat on the fence - it's an interesting subject area, but I'm not convinced by the key themes that emerge and how it links to existing work in this area)</p> <p>In summary, it's OK, but doesn't have any sense of 'wow' factor to it. The subject area is one of clear interest though.</p>
<b>RESULTS &amp; CONCLUSIONS</b>	<p>My worry is that the themes were already predetermined by the search terms used - the authors determined those terms and it's not a surprise that they come up as the key themes in the findings - this does not work for me? I appreciate that maybe this reflects my own biased approach to work in this area, where I like to see themes emerging from the data, not being pre imposed or influenced by these key terms (which may or may not be the driving forces)</p> <p>Whilst the message is clear, i do not feel that many links are made to previous literature in this area (Mike Weed's work for example, for the DoH).</p> <p>However, this piece is an interesting snapshot, but not much more.</p> <p>The conclusions are quite poor and need major development. They say nothing and add nothing to this area of study. This should not be published without a rewrite on these conclusions (in my opinion)</p>
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>I have reservations about the methods and how the key themes were predetermined and i'm not convinced that the resubmission is that different from the initial piece of work.....the conclusions are very poor and need more development before publication</p>

## VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

**Reviewer: Dr. Louise Mansfield, Deputy Director Brunel Centre for Sport, Health and Well Being, Brunel University, Uxbridge**

I would like to thank the authors for their serious and thoughtful responses to earlier comments. The revised manuscript is both clearer and more coherent at the points noted previously. I have one or two more minor points to make but I do feel they are important reflections if this paper is to be published in BMJ Open.

**Comment 1.** Could the authors clarify the numbers stated in Figure 1 (The Flow Diagram of Results) if this figure is going to be included in the revised paper. The total number meeting the inclusion criteria is stated as 351. The total is divided into 3 'themes' as follows: employment (131); physical activity (116); and wellbeing (121). I make those 3 thematic counts total 368. Can you comment?

**Response 1.** We apologise for not making this clearer in the text. Some articles included content which was relevant to more than one of the key determinants of health e.g. an article mentioning both employment and physical activity. Hence the aggregate for the 3 determinants in Figure 1 is more than 351. We have added this information to the results section and Figure 1 for clarity.

**Comment 2.** Could there be a little more transparency on the frequency counts in the text or /and cross references to Table 2 (if relevant). I think readers would benefit from knowing in the text what the frequency count numbers were and more crucially the value of the claimed increases in frequency of articles introduced in the first paragraph of the results section on page 8. Frequency and increases in frequency seem to be a key part of your quantitative work. This, for me, is a straightforward inclusion of your numbers in the text.

**Response 2.** On reflection we agree that this would aid readability of the manuscript. We have now included these numbers in the revised results section as suggested.

**Comment 3.** This is a very minor point but I was wondering if there needs to be consistency in the way that the numbers of articles in each theme are referred to from page 8 - so as to avoid any confusion. For example sometimes the phrasing refers to a number of articles included a particular theme as in '162 of 351 articles covered this pathway' (p.8) and sometimes the phrasing refers to the number of times a theme is read as in 'mentioned 131 times out of 351 total articles' (p. 8). In terms of the research approach I am not convinced that these phrases mean the same thing.

**Response 3.** Thank you for highlighting this inconsistency. Given the additions to the manuscript in response 2, we have removed these passages.

**Reviewer: Dr Richard Shipway**

**Associate Dean: International Engagement Bournemouth University, UK**

**Comment 1.** Whilst the message is clear, I do not feel that many links are made to previous literature in this area (Mike Weed's work for example, for the DoH).

**Response 1.** We did include two relevant citations of Professor Weed's work in the first revision of our manuscript. Please see below:

19. Weed M, Coren E, Fiore J, Wellard I, Mansfield L, Chatziefstathiou D, et al. Developing a physical activity legacy from the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games: a policy-led systematic review. *Perspectives in public health* 2012;132(2):75-80.

30. Weed M, Coren E, Fiore J, Mansfield L, Wellard I, Chatziefstathiou D. A systematic review of the evidence base for developing a physical activity and health legacy from the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games. London: Department of Health, 2009

**Comment 2.** The conclusions are quite poor and need major development. They say nothing and add nothing to this area of study. This should not be published without a rewrite on these conclusions (in my opinion)

**Response 2.** We fundamentally disagree with the literal interpretation of this comment. Furthermore this seems to contradict the reviewer's earlier assertion that the message is clear in this manuscript (please see comment 1).

The reviewer comments that the paper only scratches the surface of the issues in a very 'superficial and localised way'. The paper reports on media coverage in the local press (which is stated as an objective of the paper), therefore it is intended to be a localised account. The local press has the potential to provide detailed reporting on local issues and concerns around the Games, perhaps more so than the national press. Yet, as we report, local media coverage of the Games and their legacy has been overwhelmingly uncritical, positive and relatively 'superficial'. There are, of course, more critical and detailed discussions of the health impact and legacy of the Games but, as we clearly state, these are not to be found in the local press publications we examined. Our interest lay in the extent of coverage and article content relevant to the stated determinants of health inequalities in local newspapers (this information now added to page 6).

Therefore, it is logical to re-state in the conclusion that the overwhelmingly positive coverage reported in our results is unlikely to be a balanced reflection of the true impact of the 2012 games. As such, a rigorous evaluation of the tangible impacts on population health, and the determinants of health and health inequalities needs to be undertaken to understand if there is truly a lasting health legacy for deprived areas in East London.

We feel we should re-iterate that firstly, the media can be highly influential in shaping discourses around health and even influence behaviour change. Therefore, this novel piece of research has good potential to enhance the knowledge base and inform future work. Secondly, no such misgivings about the strength of the conclusions has come from Reviewer 1 who has a direct research interest in exploring the health legacies of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games (<http://www.brunel.ac.uk/sse/sport-sciences/people/dr-louise-mansfield>).