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Dear Editor,

I have reviewed the revised manuscript against the two reviewers' comments. The authors have addressed the comments of the reviewers. This has improved the quality of the paper. 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.

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.

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.

Otherwise, I feel this - albeit simple - paper has merit in being published. It is novel in it's approach and addresses a critical issue in the trustworthiness of online material relating to medical conditions and advice.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No
Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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