EJD-2021-11-33 - (1871) Manuscript submission confirmation

Manuscript: EJD-2021-11-33 - (1871) - Quality, Reliability and Usefulness of Indonesian-language Orthodontic-related YouTube Video as a Source of Health Information for General Population
Authors: Ninuk Hariyani (Corresponding Author), Aurellia Rahmawati (Co-author), yuanita rachmawati (Co-author), Anton Rahardjo (Co-author), Diah Ayu Maharani (Corresponding author)
Date submitted: 2021-11-30

Dear Dr. Hariyani
Thank you very much for submitting the above manuscript. Please refer to the manuscript number in all correspondence concerning the manuscript as listed above.

The manuscript will now be forwarded to our Editors and reviewers and we shall inform you as soon as a decision has been made by the editorial board.

The progress of your manuscript can be followed in the progress report that can be accessed from your account overview.

Sincerely,
The Editorial Office

YOUR SIGN IN INFORMATION
Website: https://www.manuscriptmanager.net/ejd
Email: ninuk_hariyani@yahoo.co.id

Forgot password or not signed in before?
Click the URL below to create/reset your password.
https://www.manuscriptmanager.net/sLib/v4/retrieve_pw.php?
paramScreen=bULRAcRJmHiQqyq8sp0LEAEcS8CJRYLBqY/vuvdMSsU=

EJD-2021-11-33 - (1871) Revise (major revisions)

From: European Journal of Dentistry (ejd@manuscriptmanager.net)

To: ninuk_hariyani@yahoo.co.id

Date: Tuesday, 4 January 2022 at 12:05 am GMT+7

Manuscript: EJD-2021-11-33 - (1871) - Quality, Reliability and Usefulness of Indonesian-language Orthodontic-related YouTube Video as a Source of Health Information for General Population

Date submitted: 2021-11-30

Dear Dr. Hariyani

Thank you very much for submitting the above manuscript to European Journal of Dentistry.

Your manuscript has now been evaluated by external reviewers and members of the editorial board. While we certainly find merit in your paper, a number of major points of criticism were raised and we therefore regret to inform you that your manuscript is not acceptable for publication in its present form. If you feel that you can adequately address the criticisms outlined in the reviewer reports below, we would be willing to reconsider a thoroughly revised version of your manuscript.

If you decide to resubmit your manuscript, please provide point-by-point answers to the reviewer criticisms in the text field provided during the online resubmission process and highlight any revisions made in your manuscript document.

We look forward to receiving the revised version within three (3) weeks and thank you, again, for submitting your manuscript to European Journal of Dentistry.

Sincerely,

Dr. Nejdet Adanir, DDS, PhD.
Editor-in-Chief, European Journal of Dentistry
Associate Professor, Department of Restorative Dentistry
College of Dentistry, King Faisal University
Al Ahsa, KSA, 31982
necdethan@gmail.com

Reviewer report:
This study may contribute an added value to current knowledge regarding health information available in social media. As rapid information can be accessed by the modern generation through fingertips, the quality, usefulness, and reliability of the information should be assessed to ensure wise decisions made by an individual in regard to their oral health. Generally, the research was properly executed and structured. However, there are some shortcomings that need to be addressed by the author.
From the title and objectives mentioned, the authors clearly indicate that this study aims to measure the quality, usefulness, and reliability of orthodontics-related videos on YouTube. This is clearly reported in the result sections as shown in the rest of the tables except for table 3. According to the reviewer's opinion, the authors have mistakenly adopt analysis methods. Are you trying to compare popularity and visibility with different categories of quality, usefulness, and reliability or otherwise? Or did the authors want to look for it relationship with these two variables?
In the result section, authors must report what is seen and not make any assumptions. The statement should be clear and concise with a significant or non-significant value must be stated in the sentences. In the discussion part, authors should critically debate on the current and available literature on the topics. More citation-related should be included to support the findings. Lastly, a clearer and more concise summary should be written according to the findings. The detail of comments can be accessed from the attached documents.

IMPORTANT - Review document(s): The following linked document(s) contain further information from the reviewers or editors.
https://www.ManuscriptManager.net/sLib/v4/marked_docs/mm_ejd~1871~0a30edb79a15~1~155.ReviewerMarkUp.pdf

----
Editor-in-Chief comments:

Cross-referencing: We would like to emphasize that we attach great importance to cross-referencing recent papers on the same topic in the European Journal of Dentistry. Therefore, it would be highly appreciated if you would check the last 5 years of the European Journal of Dentistry and cite references relevant to your article.
https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/?term=eur+j+dent

YOUR SIGN IN INFORMATION
Website: https://www.manuscriptmanager.net/ejd
Email: ninuk_hariyani@yahoo.co.id

Forgot password or not signed in before?
Click the URL below to create/reset your password.
https://www.manuscriptmanager.net/sLib/v4/retrieve_pw.php?
paramScreen=uQo8Jxini7LAY64DGSRwu9KKy/ruMFbtfWM3zPRtA64=

EJD-2021-11-33/R1 RESUBMISSION - (1871) Manuscript submission confirmation

From: European Journal of Dentistry (ejd@manuscriptmanager.net)

To: ninuk_hariyani@yahoo.co.id

Date: Tuesday, 25 January 2022 at 10:59 pm GMT+7

Manuscript: EJD-2021-11-33/R1 RESUBMISSION - (1871) - Assessment of Indonesian-language orthodontics-related YouTube video as a source of Information
Authors: Ninuk Hariyani (Corresponding Author), Aurellia Rahmawati (Co-author), yuanita rachmawati (Co-author), Anton Rahardjo (Co-author), Diah Ayu Maharani (Corresponding author)
Date submitted: 2022-01-25

Dear Dr. Hariyani
Thank you very much for submitting the above manuscript. Please refer to the manuscript number in all correspondence concerning the manuscript as listed above.

The manuscript will now be forwarded to our Editors and reviewers and we shall inform you as soon as a decision has been made by the editorial board.

The progress of your manuscript can be followed in the progress report that can be accessed from your account overview.

Sincerely,
The Editorial Office

YOUR SIGN IN INFORMATION
Website: https://www.manuscriptmanager.net/ejd
Email: ninuk_hariyani@yahoo.co.id

Forgot password or not signed in before?
Click the URL below to create/reset your password.
https://www.manuscriptmanager.net/sLib/v4/retrieve_pw.php?
paramScreen=dXakLtnR4TAZ87zN82xGfZOb3jnxLJ10GrJ8ZPiCwe8=

EJD-2021-11-33/R1 RESUBMISSION - (1871) Accept manuscript

Manuscript: EJD-2021-11-33/R1 RESUBMISSION - (1871) - Assessment of Indonesian-language orthodontics-related YouTube video as a source of Information

Date submitted: 2022-01-25

Dear Dr. Hariyani

It is a pleasure to inform you that your manuscript is now acceptable for publication in European Journal of Dentistry. Proofs of your manuscript and Copyright Transfer agreement details will be sent by the production team in due course.

Thank you,

Sincerely,

Dr. Nejdet Adanir, DDS, PhD.
Editor-in-Chief, European Journal of Dentistry
Associate Professor, Department of Restorative Dentistry
College of Dentistry, King Faisal University
Al Ahsa, KSA, 31982
necdethan@gmail.com

YOUR SIGN IN INFORMATION
Website: https://www.manuscriptmanager.net/ejd
Email: ninuk_hariyani@yahoo.co.id

Forgot password or not signed in before?
Click the URL below to create/reset your password.
https://www.manuscriptmanager.net/sLib/v4/retrieve_pw.php?
paramScreen=+76mGQmDoWKH19oxv1iUgfL0UUQP1ZjszpwtgqblnUg=

Department of Dental Public Health

Faculty of dental medicine
Universitas Airlangga

Ninuk Hariyani
Lecturer and Researcher

Faculty of Dental Medicine (FKG)
Universitas Airlangga
East Java 60132
Indonesia
Telephone +62 81314343305
ninuk_hariyani@yahoo.co.id
ninuk-h@fkg.unair.ac.id
ninuk.hariyani@adelaide.edu.au

24th January 2022

Editor-in-Chief,
European Journal of Dentistry

Dear Editor-in-Chief,

We are very grateful to you for the opportunity to revise our manuscript, and we acknowledge the time spent by the editors and reviewers in commenting on this paper. Please find below a point-by-point reply to the reviewers' comments. We hope that we have now addressed the concerns raised and believe that the manuscript has been substantially improved.

Thanking you.

Yours sincerely,

Ninuk Hariyani (Corresponding Author)

Lecturer and researcher
Department of Dental Public Health
Faculty of dental medicine
Universitas Airlangga
East Java
Indonesia

+62 81314343305
ninuk_hariyani@yahoo.co.id
ninuk-h@fkg.unair.ac.id
ninuk.hariyani@adelaide.edu.au

Editor-in-Chief comments:

Cross-referencing: We would like to emphasize that we attach great importance to cross-referencing recent papers on the same topic in the European Journal of Dentistry. Therefore, it would be highly appreciated if you would check the last 5 years of the European Journal of Dentistry and cite references relevant to your article.

Response:- Some cross-references have been added to support and extend the topic in the introduction (page 2 line 27-30) and reference no 2, 3 and 4 in page 11 line 257-263).

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

Comment 1:- This study may contribute an added value to current knowledge regarding health information available in social media. As rapid information can be accessed by the modern generation through fingertips, the quality, usefulness, and reliability of the information should be assessed to ensure wise decisions made by an individual in regard to their oral health. Generally, the research was properly executed and structured.

Response:- Thank you for your constructive feedback on our manuscript.

Comment 2:- From the title and objectives mentioned, the authors clearly indicate that this study aims to measure the quality, usefulness, and reliability of orthodontics-related videos on YouTube. This is clearly reported in the result sections as shown in the rest of the tables except for table 3. According to the reviewer's opinion, the authors have mistakenly adopted analysis methods. Are you trying to compare popularity and visibility with different categories of quality, usefulness, and reliability or otherwise? Or did the authors want to look for it relationship with these two variables?

Response:- In the analysis in table 3 we describe the comparability of video's quality, usefulness and reliability based on their views, visibility, likes and popularity. This gave additional description of the quality, usefulness, and reliability measurement of our aims. We realize that there are some misinterpretations as relation written in the result section and those have been corrected.

Comment 3:- In the result section, authors must report what is seen and not make any assumptions. The statement should be clear and concise with a significant or non-significant value must be stated in the sentences.

Response:- Thank you for the suggestion. The changes have been made accordingly (page 6-7 line 155-178).

Comment 4:- In the discussion part, authors should critically debate on the current and available literature on the topics. More citation-related should be included to support the findings.

Response:- Thank you for the suggestion. The changes have been made accordingly (page 7-8 line 181-194; line 204-2011).

Comment 5:- Lastly, a clearer and more concise summary should be written according to the findings. The detail of comments can be accessed from the attached documents.

Response:- Thank you for your constructive feedback on our manuscript. Point by point responses to your comments is provided.

<u>Detailed comments:</u>

Comment 1:- The title should be changed to "Assessment of Indonesian-language orthodontics-related YouTube video as a source of Information."

Response:- Thank you for your suggestion. The changes have been adopted in the title (page 1 line 1-2 and page 2 line 23-24).

Comment 2:- Some suggestions in the writing sections of the abstract.

Response:- Thank you for your suggestion. The changes have been adopted in the abstract (page 1 line 5-18).

Comment 3:- In the introduction: Reviewer belief that it is important to explain about orthodontic treatment which the aims is to correct malocclusion.

Response:- The importance of orthodontic treatment which the aims is to correct malocclusion has been added in the introduction (page 2-3, line 46-60)

Comment 4:- In the methods, in terms of period of data collected, is there any exact date?

Response:- The explanation about the date has been added (page 4 line 80)

Comment 5:- In the methods, How many videos were actually exist from the search? Was it only 300 videos or more?

Response:- In YouTube platform, YouTube doesn't provide facilities to see how many videos are available as a result of a search. In this research, we took the first 300 videos from the search results

Comment 6:- What do you mean of future analysis? Do you mean further analysis?

Response:- Thank you for the correction (page 4 line 83-84)

Comment 7:- Who are these evaluator? Is there any orthodontics specialist involved?

Response:- The evaluator were a dentist in dental public health department and a dental student. Both already got knowledge in orthodontics treatments.

Comment 8:- Last paragraph in the analysis of video section: There is a contradictory of scoring methods use. Are you using Singh or Kovalski?

Response:- Kovalski also adopted the scoring methods used by Singh. For clarity purposes currently we have cited Singh only (page 5 line 121).

Comment 9:- Methods: Maybe it best to include descriptive analysis.

Response:- The suggestion has been added (page 5 line 130-132)

Comment 10:- Methods: Is it less than 0.05?

Response:- Thank you for the correction. It has been revised (page 5 line 133)

Comment 11:- Results paragraph 2: Why is the data presented in the table different with what reported in sentences? There is also data presented not included in the table. Please mention.

Response:- All the data reported in the text are the same with the data presented in the table except the average duration, which was wrongly cited. Thank you for pointing it out. It has been revised (page 6 line 145-146).

Comment 12:- Results paragraph 3: Please only mentioned the data being analysed. According to the data provided, moderate quality, usefulness and reliability means that the information is there but inadequately or poorly discussed. Based on reviewer understanding, all topic has been covered but limited as presented in Figure 3. Thus, the statement incomplete is inappropriate. Maybe the words "insufficient" is more appropriate because the information is poorly discussed in the video.

Response:- Thank you for your suggestion. The correction has been made (page 6 line 151-152).

Comment 13:- Results paragraph 3: Please include the %

Response:- The percentage has been added (page 6 line 153-154)

Comment 14:- Results paragraph 4: How do you get inverse relationship? There is no relationship test was done. The analysis was only looking at differences.

Response:- Thank you for the correction. We have deleted this point and keep the information in the differences of the two groups.

Comment 15:- Results paragraph 4: suggestion in writing the results based on the video's duration.

Response:- Thank you for the suggestion. The changes have been made (page 6 line 156-161).

Comment 16:- Results paragraph 4: Please add the p-value in bracket to highlight the significant result.

Response:- Thank you for the suggestion. The p-value have been added (page 6 line 156-161).

Comment 17:- Results paragraph 5: Why author did not categorized the group into poor, moderate and good?

Response:- Reducing the presentation of the data results from ratio scale to ordinal scale (poor, moderate and good) will reduce the richness of the information available. Thus, it has been decided to keep the results presentation of the data in its original format.

Comment 18:- Results paragraph 5: misinterpreted. Have you done any regression test to see for any relationship?
Response:- Thank you for the correction. We have deleted this point and keep the information in the differences of the two groups.

Comment 19:- Results paragraph 5: Please highlight the non-significant and significant result by mentioning the p-value to avoid misleading of the reader towards the results presented.
Response:- This section has been re-write, following the suggestions (page 6-7 line 163-171)

Comment 20:- Results paragraph 6: Please separate the explanation of appendix 1 and 2. What is the reason to include this in the result as author has highlighted in the previous analysis?
Response:- We provided those appendices for readers who interested to see the title and characteristics of the top ten Indonesian-language YouTube orthodontics video. Moreover, it showed the characteristic of the top ten videos. The explanation of each appendix has been provided (page 7 line 173-178).

Comment 21:- Discussion: This should be inserted at introduction section discussed about the orthodontics treatment.
Response:- Thank you for the suggestion. The writing has been reorganized as suggested.

Comment 22:- Discussion: some suggestion in writing attached, combine into one paragraph
Response:- Thank you for your suggestion. The correction has been made (page 7 line 181-186).

Comment 23:- Discussion: Why do they have moderate quality? What others have reported about the quality to support your finding?
Response:- Videos with a moderate quality show a below ideal flow, have some important information discussed, and are quite useful to the viewers. Our finding supported previous

research about orthodontic-related videos in other language. The paragraph has been reorganised (page 7-8 line 187-184).

Comment 24:- Discussion: from statement : Video uploaders can consider the completeness of the content to make the videos useful. But how? Any idea from other study?
Response:- The discussion has been improved (page 8 line 204-208)

Comment 25:- Discussion: Author should focus on the significant result and try to relate with finding.
Response:- The discussion has been improved (page 8 line 204-208)

Comment 26:- Discussion: This is misleading statement with the statement discuss in the next sentence. Rephrase the sentence.
Response:- This statement has been paraphrase as suggested.

Comment 27:- Discussion: in the statement "The video with the highest number of views and likes in this study is a video that discusses the orthodontic treatment process", Is it mentioned anywhere in your study related to the process? Please discuss accordingly.
Response:- It was mentioned in appendix 2 (page 22).

Comment 28:- Discussion: Please state exactly when in the methods.
Response:- The explanation about the date has been added in the method section (page 4 line 80)

Comment 29:- Discussion: In the sentence "However, in this study, there were only 9 videos uploaded by health companies. Therefore, videos uploaded by health companies were not included.**",** What would be the best number to be included? Please describe.
Response:- There is no best number suggested. However, an equal or almost equal number of groups to be compared are suggested, as it could maximise the statistical power to detect differences in means for the total sample size, as well as also to provide more robustness against a particular model assumption being violated (https://www.researchgate.net/post/For-a-study-with-five-conditions-that-need-to-be-compared-across-each-group-how-important-is-it-to-have-same-sample-size-in-

each-group). Thus, as there were only 9 videos uploaded by health companies which is not equal to other type of video's uploader, the videos uploaded by health companies were not included in the analysis. Furthermore, the information provided in videos uploaded by health companies are mainly commercials content.

Comment 30:- Conclusion: Please rephrase

Response:- The conclusion has been rephrase as suggested (page 9-10 line 246-251)

Comment 31:- Figure 1-3: No figure title

Response:- Figure titles have been added in each figure (page 15, 16 and 17)

Comment 32:- Figure 3: Make sure the labels is fully shown in the figure

Response:- The last figure has been revised. The labels have fully shown (page 17 line 365)

Comment 33:- Table 1: Why used min-max rather than quartile range?

Response:- There are many forms of presenting the descriptive statistics of the data, including by presenting the min-max and the quartile range. Min-max was chosen as it showed the range, thus the information was easier to be understood. Furthermore, as the data has big spread, min-max provide more information to the readers than the quartile range.

Comment 34:- Table 2: Wasn't this data show significant? p=0.027 which is <0.05?

Response:- Thank you for the correction. It has been revised (page 19 line 374)

Comment 35:- Table 3: Why authors did not categorized the quality into poor, moderate and good as being highlighted in the conclusion that as overall it has moderate quality?

Response:- Reducing the presentation of the data results from ratio scale to ordinal scale will reduce the richness of the information available. Thus, it has been decided to keep the results presentation of the data in its original format.

Comment 36:- Appendix 1 and 2: Please include English translation

Response:- The translation has been added in appendix 1 and 2 (page 21 and 22)

Comment 37:- Reference number 20,23, 25 more than 10years

Response:- We have changed into the newer references (reference number 18, 22and 27; page 12 line 301-303; page 13 line 312-313 and line)

Comment 38:- Figure 2 : According to Menzilotoglu (2020) and Hassona (2016) in your reference, this formula is of "viewer's interaction" while you refer to popularity. Please clarify. *Response:-* We have mentioned in our methodology that the term popularity that we used was actually measuring the viewer's interaction index, while the term visibility was measuring the viewers rate (page 4 line 97-98).

Comment 39:- Appendix 2. is this a coma or dot?*Response:-* Thank you for checking. It has been checked and corrected (page 22).