

Dear Editor

I, along with my co-authors, would like to ask you to consider the attached manuscript entitled **“Internet and Social Media Usage among Orthopaedic Patients : A questionnaire-based survey ”** for publication in *The World Journal of Orthopedics*

Your comments and those of the reviewer were highly insightful and enabled us to greatly improve the quality of our manuscript. In the following pages are our point-by-point responses to the comments of the reviewer as well as your own comments.

Paragraphs which have been added or moved are coloured red and sections which have been removed have been crossed through and coloured yellow. We hope that the revisions in the manuscript and our accompanying responses will be sufficient to make our manuscript suitable for publication in *The World Journal of Orthopedics*

We look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Yours sincerely,

Tahir Mutlu DUYMUS, MD
E-mail: dr.tahirmutlu@gmail.com

RESPONSES TO EDITOR COMMENTS and ESPS PEER-REVIEW COMMENTS

1-Abstract, Results, lines 17, 19, 21

The significant differences presented here are in relation to all other groups? For instance, the internet (for asking questions to an orthopaedist) was significant difference compare to each one of the other means of communication? The same question stands also for the other significant differences.

Response:

The rate of question-asking was significantly lower in patients with an elementary education than that in those with secondary, high school and undergraduate education ($p=0.001$) The rate of reporting that the answers given was helpful was significantly higher in participants with an undergraduate degree compared to those who were illiterate, those with primary, elementary or high school education ($p=0.001$, respectively).” (Line 73-78)

2-Abstract, Results, line 19

Please replace $p=0,021$ with $p=0.021$

Response:

Thank you for your comment. It was corrected.

3-Introduction

Authors should give some information about their choice to use orthopaedic patients for their investigation. This information have to be included and the in the Discussion section.

Response:

Thank you for your comment. The following text has been added in introduction: "Facebook, Twitter, My Space and LinkedIn have been reported to be the most commonly used social networking sites around the world, being Facebook the most popular, whose use has increased rapidly in recent years (3)." (Line 114-116)

The following text has been added and edited in discussion: "The internet or social media and Facebook was reported to be the most commonly used social media tool in England." (Line 247-248)

Results, line 113

What all these significant differences stand for? Please explain.

Response:

Thank you for your comment. The following text has been added in results: "Of all participants, 19.5% (n:368) attempted to treat their orthopaedic problems/diseases using the information they obtained online. There was a strong statistically significant relationship in the rate of participants" using online information to treat their orthopedic problems/diseases according to the age groups ($p=0.001$; $p<0.01$). The rate of attempting to treat their orthopedic diseases/problems using online information was statistically significantly higher in the participants aged between 18-30 years than that in those aged between 61-75 years and older than 75 years ($p=0.030$; $p=0.003$; $p=0.049$; $p<0.05$) (Table 4). " (Line 183-190)

Results, lines 118-120

This sentence is not clear. Authors mention that there was a significant difference but they do not mention between which groups.

Response:

Thank you for your comment. The following text has been added in results: “There was a strong statistically significant difference in the rates of answering “yes” to the question of “Have you ever asked an orthopedist his/her opinion about your disease” according to the educational level of the participants (p=0,001; p<0,01). The rate of answering “yes” to the question of “Have you ever asked an orthopedist his/her opinion about your disease using the internet” was statistically significantly lower in participants who were illiterate compared to that in those with secondary, high school and undergraduate education (p=0,004; p=0,003; p=0,001; p<0,01). Similarly, the rate answering “yes” to the question of “Have you ever asked an orthopedist his/her opinion about your disease using the internet” was statistically significantly lower among participants with elementary level of education compared to that in those with secondary, high school and undergraduate education” (p=0,022; p=0,010; p=0,001; p<0,05).” (Line 199-210)

Tables

In some cases tables are very confusing since the sum % of each answer is not 100%. Authors have to check their tables or explain the different outcomes in a footnote or in the methods section.

Tables 5 and 6

Authors have to state between which groups the significant differences (p values) stand for. Again, the sum of % of each group does not equals 100%.

Response:

Thank you for your comment. It was corrected. I didn't give more information (as a yes or no answer) in the tables for reduction. Because of that they look confuse. You are right. All tables are edited again. Now tables is clearer. Yes and no answer together is in %100

Table 5: Asking an orthopedist his/her opinion over the internet and interpreting the information obtained according to educational level

		Educational Level						p
		Illiterate n(%)	Primary n(%)	Secondary n(%)	High-school n(%)	Under graduate n(%)	Post graduate n(%)	
Participants who asked an orthopaedist his/her opinion about a disease?								
	Yes	26 (21,8)	173 (28,9)	80 (37,4)	181 (36,2)	147 (44,5)	14 (33,3)	^a 0,001
	No	93 (78,2)	425 (71,1)	134 (62,6)	319 (63,8)	183 (55,5)	28 (66,7)	
With which one(s) of the following can you describe the answers you were given?								
Helpfull	Yes	5 (19,2)	34 (19,7)	12 (15)	29 (16)	10 (6,8)	1 (7,1)	^b 0,021
	No	21 (80,8)	139 (80,3)	68 (85)	152 (84)	137 (93,2)	13 (92,9)	
I became more	Yes	11 (42,3)	71 (41)	24 (30)	89 (49,2)	102 (69,4)	7 (50)	^a 0,001

confused	No	15 (57,7)	102 (59)	56 (70)	92 (50,8)	45 (30,6)	7 (50)	
Participants who attempted to treat their orthopaedic diseases based on the information they obtained from the internet								
	Yes	17 (14,3)	92 (15,4)	32 (15)	112 (22,4)	78 (23,6)	8 (19)	^a 0,004
	No	102 (85,7)	506 (84,6)	182 (85)	388 (77,6)	252 (76,4)	34 (81)	
^a Pearson Chi-Square Test		^b Fisher Freeman Halton Test			*p<0,05	**p<0,01		

Table 6: The comparison of the participants' asking an orthopaedist his/her opinion and applying the information they obtained according to their occupations

		Occupations										<i>p</i>
		Unemployed - Housewife		Officer	Worker		Manager- Qualified		Other			
		n	%	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Participants who asked an orthopaedist his/her opinion about a disease												
	Yes	349	30,8	32,5	97	28,4	123	48,2	52	65,0	^a 0,001**	
	No	784	69,2	67,5	245	71,6	132	51,8	28	35,0		
Which one(s) of the following do you prefer to ask an orthopaedist his/her opinion?												
Facebook	Yes	59	16,9	11,5	24	24,7	14	11,4	3	5,8	^b 0,018*	
	No	290	83,1	88,5	73	75,3	109	88,6	49	94,2		
Twitter	Yes	12	3,4	3,8	4	4,1	8	6,5	2	3,8	^b 0,645	
	No	337	96,6	96,2	93	95,9	115	93,5	50	96,2		

Physician's personal website	Yes	76	21,8	34,6	17	17,5	32	26,0	15	28,8	^a 0,236
	No	273	78,2	65,4	80	82,5	91	74,0	37	71,2	
Websites allowing asking physicians questions	Yes	177	50,7	50,0	35	36,1	62	50,4	28	53,8	^a 0,113
	No	172	49,3	50,0	62	63,9	61	49,6	24	46,2	
With which one(s) of the following can you describe the answers you were given?											
I became more confused	Yes	67	19,2	19,2	11	11,3	9	7,3	10	19,2	^b 0,012*
	No	282	80,8	80,8	86	88,7	114	92,7	42	80,8	
Helpfull	Yes	150	43,0	46,2	42	43,3	79	64,2	31	59,6	^a 0,001**
	No	199	57,0	53,8	55	56,7	44	35,8	21	40,4	
Participants who attempted to treat their orthopaedic diseases based on the information they obtained from the internet											
	Yes	193	17,0	23,8	86	25,1	58	22,7	12	15,0	^a 0,005**
	No	940	83,0	76,3	256	74,9	197	77,3	68	85,0	
^a PearsonChi-Square Test		^b FisherFreemanHalton Test				*p<0,05		**p<0,01			

ESPS PEER-REVIEW COMMENTS

1-This is a very interesting manuscript. Limitation I see is, that it reflects the Situation in Turkey, which cannot be transferred completely to other countries. This should be noted in Discussion.

Response:

Thank you for your comment. The following text has been deleted „Turkey“ in AIM section. It was corrected.

