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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Dr. Ping Yu, Editor of BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making,

We really appreciate the reviewer’s comments and suggestions for our Manuscript ID MIDM-D-19-00307 entitled “A Study on Users’ Preference towards Diabetes Related Video Clips on YouTube”. These comments and suggestions are very helpful and useful. Based on these comments and suggestions, we revised our paper. The comments of the reviewers were addressed respectively. The corresponding changes were integrated and highlighted in the revised paper.

A revision summary is shown in the followings.

The responses to the first reviewer’s comments:
Response:
   Method section, Page 6, Line 5. The sentence was changed to “A mixed research method …”.

2. It is more intuitive to provide the readers with a figure of the predictive model, which illustrates the relationships among the factors and users’ attitudes.
Response:
   Since there are multiple factors in each of the two predictive models, it is difficult to illustrate the relationships among the factors and users’ attitudes in one figure. Therefore, the researchers created a figure for every pair of factors and positive/negative attitude for each of the models. The following content was inserted to the Results section, Page 19, Line 11:

   “Figure 5 displays the relationships among the media type (subfigure a), the presentation setting (subfigure b), the post period (subfigure c), the presenter role (subfigure d),
the presenters’ gender (subfigure e), and the users’ positive attitude. Every subfigure in Figure 5 illustrates the relationship between a factor and the users’ positive attitude.

Figure 5. Relationships among Factors and Users’ Positive Attitude”

Figure 5 was uploaded to the article submission system.

The following content was inserted to the Results section, Page 22, Line 19:

“Figure 6 displays the relationships among the post period (subfigure a), the presenter role (subfigure b), the Sign & Symptom subject (subfigure c), the Nutrient subject (subfigure d), and the users’ negative attitude. Every subfigure in Figure 6 illustrates the relationship between a factor and the users’ negative attitude.

Figure 6. Relationships among Factors and Users’ Negative Attitude”

Figure 6 was uploaded to the article submission system.

3. The logic flow of the paper can be further improved. Some verbose expressions could be deleted. For example, p. 16 “As it was mentioned before …”. And also, the method (p. 27) does not need to repeat in the Conclusion part.

Response:

Method section, Page 8, Line 7. The expression “As it is mentioned before” was deleted.

Results section, Page 15, Line 20. The expression “As it was mentioned before” was deleted.

Results section, Page 16, Line 15. The expression “As it was mentioned before” was deleted.

Discussion section, Page 23, Line 15. The expression “In other words” was deleted.

Conclusion section, Page 28, Line 3. The sentences about the method were removed from the Conclusion part. These sentences are:

“A mixed research method was applied in this study containing both data coding and statistical approaches. The coding process discovered the patterns among the independent variables such as presenters’ roles, video settings, and subjects, while a series of negative binomial regression tests identified the significant relationships existing between the factors and users’ preferences about diabetes-related videos on YouTube.”

4. The diction needs to be better considered, especially the key terms. These terms are always accurate and constant throughout the whole paper, which reinforces readers’ impression. For example, “characteristics” or “factors”? Does “characteristics” in the first research question mean “factors” in the second research question? If so, why change? If not, what is their relationship? This might cause the confusion from readers’ perspective.

Response:

Method section, Page 5, Line 18. In the research questions, “characteristics” and “factors” have different meanings. For the first research question, “characteristics” mean the specific features of the investigated diabetes-related videos, which are revealed by descriptive statistics. For example, the distribution of the presentation settings and the distribution of the media types are regarded as the characteristics of the investigated videos. For the other research questions, “factors” are the attributes of a video that potentially affect the users’ attitude. For example, number of views and presentation setting are two factors of a video.

Method section, Page 6, Line 1. The following sentence was added to the content:
“In the research questions, characteristics mean the specific features of the collection of the investigated diabetes-related videos and factors are the attributes of a video that potentially affect the users’ attitude.”

5. Please provide references to support the first paragraph of page 10.
Response:
Method section, Page 10, Line 3. The following references were added to the first paragraph of page 10. The newly added papers were also inserted into the References.

The responses to the second reviewer’s comments:

1. In Page 4, The paragraph “Health consumers and their usage…” seems confusing to me. It doesn’t have clear relationship to other paragraphs in this section. This paragraph talks about the health consumers and their usage of the user generated content, taking search activities on Q&A sites as an example, while the other paragraphs focus on talking about video-based social medias. This paragraph should be revised to clearly explain the relationship between the given example and the aim of this study.
Response:
Background section, Page 4, Line 13. The paragraph “Health consumers and their usage…” and the related references were deleted.

2. In the second paragraph of Page 8, the authors claimed that the remaining attributes were the factors influencing the users’ attitude, but didn’t give the explanation. It seems to me that this attributes are just the possible factors related to users’ attitudes. The authors should revise this sentence to give a more convincing explanation. Similar problems occurs in the second paragraph of Page 27 (the second finding).
Response:
Method section, Page 8, Line 8. The sentence was changed to:
“The remaining attributes (number of views, post period, video duration, presenter’s gender, presentation setting, presenter role, media type, and subjects of video) were the possible factors influencing the users’ attitude.”

Conclusion section, Page 28, Line 9. The sentence was changed to:
“(2) several factors that would probably impact users’ preferences of both positive and negative sides about these video-clips were identified.”
3. In Table 2, there are two identical headers which are confusing. Maybe the second ‘Variable’ should be renamed as ‘Variable Type’.
Response:
Method section, Page 11, Line 19. The second “Variable” was renamed as “Variable Type”.

4. Also in the first column of Table 2, the item ‘Video’ should be renamed as ‘Video duration’.
Response:
Method section, Page 12, Line 5. The item “Video” was renamed as “Video duration”.

5. Page 19 line 4, the authors said that there is no significant difference between the videos whose presenters are medical professionals and other roles, but in Table 6, this item has a P-value of 0.002 < 0.05. This conflict should be corrected.
Response:
Results section, Page 19, Line 1. The words “other roles” were removed from the original sentence and the sentence was changed to:

“However, there is no significant difference between the videos whose presenters are reporters, or parents and the videos whose presenters were medical professionals.”

6. In Table 7, the subject ‘Nutrient’ doesn’t have significant effects on the users’ negative attitude, but it shows up in Table 8 and is significant. The authors said that after a series of tests, the factors which have no significant influence on the negative attitude were removed from the regression model. Based on the reasoning process from Table 5 to Table 6, I don’t understand why the ‘Nutrient’ item was included in Table 8. Please explain the concrete reasoning process from Table 7 to Table 8.
Response:
Results section, Page 20, Line 2. The following content was added to the Results section:

“In Table 7, although the subject “Nutrient” and the subject “Social & Culture” have no significant effect on the users’ negative attitude, their corresponding P values are close to 0.05 and smaller than 0.1. Therefore, these two factors were included in the second regression model, together with Poster Period, Presenter Role, and Sign & Symptom. The results of the second test are showed in Table 8.”

"Table 8. Five Factors’ Influences on the Negative Attitude" (Table 8 was included in the revised manuscript)

"The results in Table 8 reveal that Post Period, Presenter Role, Sign & Symptom, and Nutrient have significant influence on the users’ negative attitude, while Social & Culture does not influence the users’ negative attitude significantly. Therefore, in the third test, only the Post Period, Presenter Role, Sign & Symptom, and Nutrient factors were included as the dependent variables. The results of the third test are displayed in Table 9."
7. The standard error for each independent variable was displayed in Table 5 to 8, but was not explained in the manuscript. The authors should give an explanation of the relationship between the standard error data and the research findings.

Response:
   Results section, Page 16, Line 20. The following sentences were added to the content:
   “The standard errors measure the accuracy of the coefficients. Together with the coefficients, they were used to calculate the corresponding Z-values and P-values.”

8. Page 23 line 16, what’s the meaning of ‘literacy review’?

Response:
   Discussion section, Page 24, Line 20. The words were changed to “literature review”.

9. Page 24 the authors used Adbul et al.’s study to explain the associations between users’ attitude and subject categories. However, the study just proved videos that are more visually appealing can attract more audience. The authors should further explain the relationship between Adbul et al.’s study and subject categories.

Response:
   Discussion section, Page 25, Line 8. The following sentences were added to the second paragraph of Page 25:
   “According to Syed-Abdul et al.’s article, the videos with actual body images were more visually appealing to users than the videos without body images in the category of ‘Treatment’ and ‘Prevention’ [5]. In other words, users preferred videos in the ‘Organ and Body Part’ category. However, the phenomenon is not substantiated in this study as there is no significant relationship observed between users’ attitudes and the subject ‘Organ and Body Part’ for diabetes related content.”

10. In the first paragraph of Conclusion, the diabetes themes should be one of the characteristics of the videos. The taxonomy in the manuscript is a little confusing.

Response:
   Conclusion section, Page 26, Line 16. In the first paragraph of Conclusion, “diabetes themes” has the same meaning as “diabetes subjects”, which means the subjects of the diabetes-related YouTube videos. The word “themes” in the first paragraph of Conclusion was changed to “subjects”.

11. Please improve the resolution of figures.

Response:
   The resolution of all the figures was improved, and the newly created figures were uploaded to the article submission system.