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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

On behalf of my co-authors, we thank you very much for the opportunity to resubmit our revised manuscript (PUBH-D-18-03987R1) entitled “YouTube™ as a source of information on food poisoning”. We thank you and the reviewers for your constructive suggestions and comments. We have responded point by point to the comments and have made revision in the revised manuscript. We hope that the revised manuscript is now acceptable for publication. Here below is our description on corresponding revisions according to the reviewer’s and editor’s comments.

Sheryl Hendriks (Reviewer 3):

(1) I feel that points 4 and 5 in the list of comments from the reviewers - as provided by the authors - need to be integrated into the text. These comments relate to an essential clarification of the methodology and need to be in the published article. They relate to the selection of search terms and the use of the Mesh criteria.

Authors’ answer: Review’s comments are helpful and valuable to improve our manuscript. Therefore, we have integrated the explanations into the method part (Methods section, line 6-15, page 4) accordingly:
“This study was exempt from Institutional Review Board approval of the study institution because it involved the use of public access data only. Using methods used previously[11], YouTube ™ (www.youtube.com) was systematically searched on May 10, 2018 for videos containing relevant information about food poisoning. In the Mesh (Medical Subject Headings, MeSH), it is explained that “foodborne disease” is often called “food poisoning”. In addition to “food poisoning”, other entry terms are combinations of “foodborne” and “disease/illness”. So, the search terms were determined as “food poisoning”, “foodborne disease” and “foodborne illness” to minimize the impact of other synonyms as much as possible. The search for these three terms yielded 697040 videos in total (food poisoning-673000 videos, foodborne disease-5740 videos, foodborne illness-18300 videos). The first 5 pages (20 videos/page × 5 pages = 100 videos) of each search result were screened on the assumption that users would not go beyond the first 5 pages of a search result[5, 15]. We used YouTube's default sorting option -- "relevance", which may be the most commonly used option in the algorithms for YouTube sorting (relevance, upload date, views count, rating). All the advertisements in the search results and in the beginning of video were ignored.”

(2) I also feel that the response to comment 8 (on the low credibility of much of the content on the internet) needs to be included in the conclusion section as a recommendation. The authors make an important point in their response to the critique but do not include it in the paper.

Authors’ answer: Thanks for your nice suggestion. We agree with the reviewer and have included this point in the conclusion (Conclusion section, line 7-9, page 13).

“Considering that there is a lot of low-credibility information, consumers need to be guided to reliable videos in the field of healthcare information.”

(3) In addition, although the detailed statistics have been provided in Table 4, the last column of P values needs to include an indication of whether the result is statistically significant or not.

Authors’ answer: Reviewer’s comments are very reasonable. As Reviewer suggested, Table 4 and Table 5 were revised accordingly and "*" were used to indicate statistical significance.

Thank you again for your positive comments on our manuscript.

Editor’s comments:

1. On the title page, please clarify which author you would like to act as the corresponding author upon publication. Please also be sure to include any changes in the submission system.
Authors’ answer: Thanks for your comments. Both Bo Li and Weiwei Cui are corresponding authors. We have indicated this on the title page.

2. If you did not need formal ethics approval, in the Ethics approval and consent to participate section, please confirm that this complies with national guidelines and provide a reference which supports this. Alternatively, supply a statement that says that a local ethics committee ruled that no formal ethics approval was required in this particular case.

Authors’ answer: Thanks for your suggestion. We have provided a statement. Should you have any question, please feel free to contact me.

3. Please proofread and ensure that when you upload your revised submission that it is in the final form for publication. Please remove any tracked changes, colored text, or highlighting and include only a single clean copy of the manuscript. Should you wish to respond to these revision requests, please include the information in the designated input box only.

Authors’ answer: Thank you for your comments. We have revised the manuscript accordingly.