

Reviewer Response

Reviewer #1 asks for three very specific revisions.

- In the abstract, the suggestion to depict the *CEGRM* as more comprehensive than assessing social networks solely, was addressed. The description now reflects the full capabilities of the tool.
- The term *kaleidoscope* is now defined within the text
- The word *impact* was changed to *influence*

Reviewer #2 suggests

- Introducing children earlier in the manuscript. This suggestion was adopted and the information re: why this research approach is important for children was added.
- Clarification be added to the analysis discussion, emphasizing that *a priori* questions and the children's responses were used as the primary organizing framework. This suggestion is now specifically addressed in the methods section and in the abstract.
- Using bolding for headings was not appropriate and APA guidelines for numbers and time needed to be reviewed. The bolding was eliminated and APA guidelines for numbers and time were carefully reviewed and applied.
- Anthropomorphism needs to be corrected. This was challenging in that no specific examples were shared. An independent review of the manuscript by two peers did not find anthropomorphisms.

Reviewer #3's suggestions for the manuscript were more global.

- S/he notes that although selected elements of the *CEGRM* are used, there was too little in common with the *CEGRM* methodology to support this as a children's version. I appreciate this comment. The focus of the study (and manuscript) was to adapt the *CEGRM* for use with children. It was not to make a child's version of the tool. I worked very closely with Regina Kenen, the developer of the *CEGRM* in my adaptations. She reviewed the initial manuscript as well as the current revisions. In response to the reviewer, she stated "your approach is definitely an adaptation of the original and appears very useful with children". She shared that in the original *CEGRM* publications, readers were encouraged to adapt the *CEGRM* for use in different contexts and populations and "make it their own". Further, she offered to write in support of this 'creative extension of the *CEGRM*'. To address the Reviewer #3's concerns, I have revised the manuscript to say that *elements of the CEGRM were adapted* so there is no confusion that this is not a child's version of the tool.
- The next comment is for a more formal presentation in the formulation of the theoretical/conceptual framework as well as operational definitions used in the study. I have added a section on the theoretical underpinnings that informed the study as well as the concepts operationalized in the *CEGRM* and have connected these to prior research and study data to the extent possible in an exploratory qualitative study.

- The reviewer shares that the discussion section is vague and underdeveloped. This section has been reworked and enhanced.
- The suggestion to include a review of the literature on cognitive development, social networks, or the health belief model seemed beyond the scope of this manuscript. However, I appreciate the reviewer's sense that tying the discussion to larger conceptual content might better frame the study. I believe I have addressed this concern with the inclusion of the theoretical underpinnings of the study and of the CEGRM. In addition, I added more information about social constructivism as it relates both to the CEGRM and to the use of children's drawings.

Style Checklist suggestions were addressed including

- Removing abbreviations from the title, supplying the professional title for each author, and a running head.
- The reference list was updated using APA format with special attention to spacing and commas as well as the use of et al with multiple authors.
- The reminder that the journal can include color figures on the Editor's website was appreciated and color versions of each of the children's drawings as well as the adult CEGRM are provided along with this resubmission.