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1. Reviewer 1 Prof El Tantawi comments

I have no objection to using the nonpar test. My point is about reporting the mean ranks instead of the arithmetic mean (SD) or median (IQR). The mean rank is not a summary measure. It should be replaced by one of the two: mean (SD) or median (IQR).

In the document you kindly provided, in page 4, under "Reporting the Results", this was mentioned "A Friedman test was carried out to compare the total understanding scores for the four methods. There was found to be a significant difference between the methods, (3) 41.372, 0.001 2 \chi^2 = p < Dunn-Bonferroni post hoc tests were carried out and there were significant differences between the Old video C and the Doctors video B (p = 0.001), the demonstration D (p <0.001) and video A (p<0.001) after Bonferroni adjustments. There were no significant differences between any other methods".

There was no mention of mean ranks. Pls also check: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25193250 and https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24152806. These are 2 BMC oral Health articles using Friedman test and reporting the mean (SD). Pls replace the mean ranks with mean (SD) or median
Response: We have added the Median (IQR) to Table 2 (In Green) and we will keep mean ranks in as that is important to understand the result of the statistical test used which is based on mean ranks.

2. As for Editor technical comments

Technical Comments:

1. Please note that all manuscripts must contain all the following sections under the heading 'Declarations'. The Declarations should follow the Abbreviations section, and be before the References.
   - Ethics approval and consent to participate
   - Consent for publication
   - Availability of data and material
   - Competing interests
   - Funding
   - Authors' contributions
   - Acknowledgements

We note that you have not included an acknowledgements section. If you have no acknowledgements please put ‘Not Applicable’ in this section.

2. Please include the email addresses for all authors on the title page. The corresponding author should still be indicated.

3. Please represent authors' names using their initials, not their full name, in the Authors’ Contributions section. If there are any duplicated initials, please differentiate them to make it clear that the initials refer to separate authors.

4. Please rename the 'Introduction' heading to 'Background', 'Materials and Methods' to 'Methods' and 'Conflict of interests' to 'Competing Interests'.

5. Please provide figure titles/legends under a separate heading of 'Figure Legends' after the References. If Figure titles/legends are within the main text of the manuscript, please move them.

6. Figures should be provided as separate files only, and each figure of a manuscript should be submitted as a single file. Please remove the figure form the manuscript file. The same applies for Tables bigger than A4 size.

7. Please include a 'Conclusions' heading after the 'Discussion'.

Editor Comments:

1. Please confirm whether informed consent, written or verbal, was obtained from all participants and clearly state this in your manuscript. If verbal, please state the reason and whether the ethics committee approved this procedure. If the need for consent was waived by an IRB or is deemed unnecessary according to national regulations, please clearly state this, including the name of the IRB or a reference to the relevant legislation.
Response: We have addressed Editor’s comments at the end of the paper before references (In Yellow).