Author’s response to reviews

Title: Quality of Websites about Long-Acting Reversible Contraception: a Descriptive Crosssectional Study

Authors:

Catrin Eriksson (catrin.eriksson.90@gmail.com)
Matilda Skinstad (matilda.skinstad@gmail.com)
Susanne Georgsson (susanne.georgsson@rkh.se)
Tommy Carlsson (tommy.carlsson@kbh.uu.se)

Version: 2 Date: 06 Nov 2019

Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

Thank you for the opportunity to again revise the manuscript entitled “Quality of Websites about Long-Acting Reversible Contraception: a Descriptive Cross-sectional Study”, submitted to Reproductive Health. The comments were very valuable and helped improve the manuscript further. Please find our responses to the comments below.

Comment #1
Line 31: You stated that “Long-acting reversible contraception are recommended for those who wish to prevent unintended pregnancies”. However, short-acting and permanent contraceptive methods are also recommended to prevent unintended pregnancy. Please revise the text accordingly.

Response
We have revised the background of the abstract.

Comment #2
Line 38: please replace ‘Reliability and information about treatment choices’ with ‘Reliability and information about contraceptive choices’

Response
We have revised the wording “treatment choices” to “long-acting contraceptive choices” throughout the manuscript. We have also revised Figure 2 so that it is in line with this.

Comment #3
Line 46: replace ‘publication’ with ‘information’; exclude ‘if it was clear’
Response
We have revised the text.

Comment #4
Line 52: “Readability Index was 42.5” – out of what? 100?

Response
There is no maximum value of LIX. We have added text about the levels of LIX in the abstract and the methods sections, and hope that this clarifies the meaning of the result in the abstract.

Comment #5
Line 65: replace ‘do not need to be remembered in order to work’ with ‘do not require user compliance after insertion’ – Reference https://www.thelancet.com/action/showPdf?pii=S2214-109X%2818%2930481-9

Response
We have revised the sentence.

Comment #6
Line 66: After ‘device can easily be removed by a health professional’, include ‘restoring the woman’s ability to get pregnant’.

Response
We have revised the sentence.

Comment #7
Line 66: replace ‘members of the public’ with ‘potential clients’ or ‘individuals seeking for information’.

Response
We have revised the sentence.

Comment #8
Line 71: replace ‘public’ with ‘general public’.

Response
We have revised the sentence.

Comment #9
Line 73-74: replace ‘determined the readability with an automated calculation’ with ‘evaluated their readability’.

Response
We have revised the sentence.

Comment #10
Line 74: add ‘most’ before ‘websites were unreliable sources’.
Response
We have revised the sentence.

Comment #11
Line 75: exclude ‘regarding’ and replace ‘treatment’ with ‘long-acting reversible contraceptive’.
Response
We have revised the sentence.

Comment #12
Lines 76-77: ‘but many still lacked information about important aspects to consider when deciding which contraception to use’ – please provide a couple examples.
Response
We have revised the sentence.

Comment #13
Line 78: replace ‘classified difficult’ with ‘classified as difficult’.
Response
We have revised the sentence.

Comment #14
Line 78-79: exclude ‘The conclusion of this study is that quality of websites about long-acting reversible contraception is poor.’
Response
We have removed the sentence.

Comment #15
Line 93: ‘with reported rates between 15 and 24%’ – where?
Response
We have revised the manuscript to further elaborate on prevalence and regional differences.

Comment #16
Line 96-98: replace ‘Thus, informed choices are essential in the context of contraceptive counseling [13], defined as health-related choices based on relevant knowledge and consistent with the decision-makers’ values’ with ‘Thus, informed choices are essential in the context of contraceptive counseling [13], allowing clients to make choices based on relevant knowledge and consistent with their values’.
Response
We have revised the sentence.

Comment #17
Line 106-108: please relocate the sentence ‘Clients often seek information about LARC from a variety of sources during the decision-making process, including the Web [15].’ in the beginning of the next paragraph and revise the next sentence not to be repetitive.
We have revised the manuscript.

Comment #18
The introduction is a bit repetitive and too long. Please revise it, trying to reduce to about 2 pages.

Response
We have revised the background and reduced it so that it is about 2 pages long.

Comment #19
Line 124-125: exclude ‘This illustrates a current problem, as clients seek web-based information but health professionals seldom guide them towards the most appropriate websites.’.

Response
We have removed the sentence.

Comment #20
Line 133: ‘clinical recommendations from leading organizations’ – which recommendations? And which organizations?

Response
We have revised the sentence.

Comment #21
Line 136-137: exclude ‘The authors concluded that it is vital to continuously evaluate the quality of web-based information about LARC’

Response
We have removed the sentence.

Comment #22
Line 140: replace ‘insights how’ with ‘insights on how’

Response
We have revised the sentence.

Comment #23
Line 140-143: exclude ‘Such studies may provide new insights how to appropriately discuss web-based information during contraceptive counseling. If website quality LARC is low, clients who consider different contraceptive alternatives are at risk of reading unsuitable material that would undermine the decision-making process.’.

Response
We have removed the sentences.

Comment #24
In the methods section, I was confused with the search. Firstly you stated ‘we designed the searches … limiting the data collection to the first web page presented when accessing the link in the hit list, and
screening the first ten links of the hit list before moving on to a new search’, then in line 179 you state that ‘the first 10 hits of each search were screened for inclusion, resulting in 200 hits screened in total’. Was the data collection limited to the first web page or to the 10 first ones?

Response
We screened the first 10 hits, as it was presented in the search engine. Thus, a total of 200 hits/links were screened. The eligible hits/links were then included in the sample. Our intention was that the results should represent the way laypersons navigate the Web to search for and read information. Studies show that information-seekers seldom read beyond the first web page at a certain website and that they move on to searching in the search engine. This means that few enter additional links found on a certain website. Therefore, we did not access any additional links presented within the identified page retrieved from the search engine. We have revised the section and hope that this clarifies the process.

Comment #25
Figure 1: replace ‘virtal community’ with ‘virtual community’.

Response
We have revised the figure.

Comment #26
Why were websites with PDF files excluded?

Response
Links from the search engine leading to a singular PDF document and containing no other content were excluded. We consider PDF documents as written information that is not primarily developed with the purpose to serve as a website. From our perspectives, PDF documents are more closely related to information brochures than websites. We have added text about this in the discussion.

Comment #27
Line 191: replace ‘(Figure 1)’ with ‘Details about the search process are presented in Figure 1.’

Response
We have revised the manuscript.

Comment #28
Line 197-199: ‘we assessed the websites regarding five different quality aspects: xxx’ – cite the five aspects.

Response
We have revised the manuscript.

Comment #29
Line 199-206: exclude ‘We evaluated… assess the readability of Swedish texts’. All this information is provided in detail later on in the paper.

Response
We have revised the manuscript.
Comment #30
Line 203: replace ‘treatment’ with ‘contraceptive’

Response
We have revised the sentence.

Comment #31
Completeness evaluation – it was still not clear for me how you analyzed it. Did you have a list of topics that should be covered?

Response
The analysis was inductive, meaning that the results were derived from the data. The analysis was not guided by preconceived models or theories. In other words, the categories we identified were derived from the data and we did not use a pre-established list of topics. We chose an inductive approach because we wanted to be open towards the topics described in the websites and because we aimed to have the results illustrate all aspects covered by the websites. We have added text about this and hope that this clarifies our method.

Comment #32
Line 272: include ‘… and the Swedish government or health…’

Response
We have revised the manuscript.

Comment #33
Line 273: exclude ‘In the latter category, all websites originated from the Swedish government or health care system.’

Response
We have removed the sentence.

Comment #34
Table 1: replace the title with ‘Mean DISCERN scores of the included websites (n=46) according to source of website and the overall interrater reliability’; in the column ‘Question’, state ‘Question [score range]’; replace ‘Total sample’ with ‘Overall’; Include the n of each source of website (government or health care system, pharmaceutical company and Independent information website or charity/organization).

Response
We have revised the manuscript.

Comment #35
Line 285-287: ‘A closer inspection of interrater reliability revealed that the questions in the DISCERN instrument showed excellent (n=5 of 16 questions), good (n=3 of 16 questions), fair (n=3 of 16 questions) and poor (n=5 of 16 questions) agreement’ – where is this information available?

Response
The levels of interrater reliability is presented in lines 222-225. The interrater reliability is presented in Table 1. We have revised the text so that it refers to Table 1.
Comment #36
Line 296-296: exclude ‘The lowest means were found for the questions concerning clear which sources that were used to compile the publication (M 1.3, SD 0.8), provide additional sources of support and information (M 2.1, SD 1.1) and overall quality (M 2.3, SD 1.1). The highest means were found for the questions concerning describe risks of treatment (M 4.3, SD 1.2), describe benefits of treatment (M 3.9, SD 1.2) and relevance (M 3.6, SD 0.8).’

Response
We have removed the sentences.

Comment #37
The first paragraph of the discussion is too long and very repetitive. It should just state the main findings of this paper. Please revise it to reduce the text and move whatever is important to keep for later on the discussion to improve the text flow.

Response
We have revised the manuscript.

Comment #38
Exclude the subsection titles of the discussion.

Response
We have removed the subsection titles.

Comment #39
Line 415-417: exclude ‘Nevertheless, we cannot make any claims whether or not other search engines would result in a different sample.’ – a similar sentence is already stated later on in the limitations.

Response
We have removed the sentence.

Comment #40
Line 435: exclude ‘on the other hand’

Response
We have revised the sentence.

Comment #41
Line 439: exclude ‘cross sectional and longitudinal’; add ‘in other countries and languages’ after ‘about LARC’.

Response
We have revised the sentence.

Comment #42
Line 465: replace ‘completeness’ with ‘completeness of information’

Response
We have revised the sentence.

Comment #43
Line 466-467: ‘most websites display notable quality deficits across the investigated quality criteria’ – I think this part of the sentence is not adding much. Instead, give recommendations of what could be included/changed in the websites to improve their quality.

Response
We have revised the conclusions according to your comment.

Comment #44
Abbreviations: there are many other abbreviations used in the text – please include them in the list of abbreviations.

Response
We have added the other abbreviations. Please note that DISCERN is not an abbreviation.