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Reviewer's report:

Dear Authors,

This manuscript, "YouTube as a source of information on food poisoning," provides readers with a content analysis of Youtube videos about food poisoning related topics. The research topic does have its novelty. I do hope that you will take my comments in the manner in which I intend, that is, to refine your manuscript toward a stronger final product.

----------------------

Major issues

"The videos was further divided into four categories[16,17]: Education; Entertainment; News & Politics; People & Blogs." (p.4)

—— I am wondering if the author(s) could provide more details about this, at least list some examples for the four categories. I understand that the authors may adopted this categorization from previous research, but as a reader who is new to this topic, he/she may don't understand what videos can be categorized as entertainment, what videos are considered as people & blogs, etc.

"Each video was scored by two independent viewers (M. Li, S.M. Yan) who were knowledgeable in the risk factors, epidemiology, etiology, symptoms, diagnosis, treatment and prevention of food poisoning, and disagreements were resolved by an arbitrator (W.W. Cui). The scores given by the two viewers were then averaged to give an overall score that was used for final results and statistical analysis."(p.5)

—— My biggest concern lies in the data analysis process, in other words, have the authors ever attempted to obtain an inter-coder reliability? Can you provide inter-coder reliability statistics in any forms (percent agreement, Scottís pi, and Krippendorffís alpha, etc.)? Even if you had a third person — a supervisor who might be an expert in this area — to review your analysis results, it
still make no sense if the two coders had a lot of very different scores and you just simply average the scores and think "problems solved".

Statistics in Table 1 and Table 3

— The standard deviations were very large. Readers use a standard deviation to get an approximate feel for the range of the data. If the data is too skewed or has too many outliers, then simply reporting standard deviation is not enough, at least to me. It would be benefit if the authors could add more statistics, such as the range (minimum and maximum value) or interquartile range (25th percentile and 75 percentile) for better understanding.

==========

Minor issues

"Every year, foodborne diseases are estimated to cause approximately 76 million illnesses, 325,000 hospitalizations, and 5,000 deaths in the United States [3]" (p.3)

— The reference of these statistics ("Mead PS, Slutsker L, Dietz V, McCaig LF, Bresee JS, Shapiro C, Griffin PM, Tauxe RV: Food-related illness and death in the United States. Emerging infectious diseases 1999, 5(5):607-625. ") is way too old, almost twenty years ago. I am wondering if the authors could find a more recent reference to replace this, since Youtube didn't even exist a decade ago.

"The Global Quality Scale (GQS)…" (p.5)

— If I were the authors, I would probably present the scale as a table, which will be clearer and much more readable.
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