Author’s response to reviews

Title: Gender differences in the associations between age trends of social media interaction and well-being among 10-15 year olds in the UK

Authors:
Cara Booker (cbooker@essex.ac.uk)
Amanda Sacker (a.sacker@ucl.ac.uk)
Yvonne Kelly (y.kelly@ucl.ac.uk)

Version: 3 Date: 13 Feb 2018

Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Ms. Pafitis,

Reply to Reviewers Comments: Gender differences in the associations between age trends of social media use and well-being among 10-15 year olds in the UK

Thank you again for your comments and those of the reviewers. We have set out our detailed response to each point below. We have also tracked the changes in the manuscript.

Yours sincerely,

Cara Booker
(on behalf of all authors)

Editor Comments:

1. Please removing your funding information from your 'Acknowledgements' section. Here you should please only acknowledge anyone who contributed towards the article who does not meet
the criteria for authorship including anyone who provided professional writing services or materials.

We have deleted the funding information from our ‘Acknowledgements’ section.

2. Please state at the end of your ‘Authors’ Contributions’ section that 'All authors read and approved the final manuscript.'

This sentence has been added to the end of the ‘Authors’ Contributions’ section

3. Please state specifically in your 'Ethics approval and consent to participate' that parental consent was not only required but also obtained for adolescents aged 10-15.

We have amended the manuscript to read ‘Youth participation required the interviewer to ask the parent/guardian for their verbal consent, and receive an affirmative response, and then to ask the young person for their consent, at which point the young person was free to agree or refuse.’ The ‘Ethics approval and consent to participate’ section has also been edited. The final sentence now reads ‘For adolescents aged 10-15, parental or responsible adult verbal consent was required and obtained for participation.’

Reviewer reports:

Cecilie Thogersen-Ntoumani (Reviewer 3): Broadly speaking I think the authors have done a good and a comprehensive job of responding to the reviewers.

1. However, I think the response regarding why the authors didn't consider different types of uses needs further deliberation. What is it about active interaction that is so important to wellbeing compared to passive engagement? I don't think it's enough to state that it's a limitation of the study that other types of use were not considered.

We have added a section to the strengths section about our use of ‘active interaction’ questions. ‘Finally, the questions included in this study only assess one form of active social media interaction, i.e. chatting, and does not assess other forms of active interaction, nor passive interaction. So while we cannot examine differences between active and passive use, we are able
to look at longitudinal effects of active use. Active interaction implies content contribution or creation while passive interaction includes reading but not commenting on posts. Thus active social media interaction may lead to increased feelings of connectedness and thus better well-being. The findings from this study contradict this hypothesis as well as previous findings.\cite{22}

2. There is also some awkward wording in places, e.g., p. 3: Television viewing greatly expanded the world to people and p. 4: "As research into the effects of social media use and interaction has increased theoretical framework underlying the relationship…"

We have gone through the manuscript and have amended awkward wording throughout.