

Response to reviewers

- We would like to express our gratitude to the reviewers for spending the valuable time and effort for reviewing our work. The valuable remarks were attempted precisely. -

Reviewer (1)

Reviewer's comments	Answer
1. In table 3, no social media can have more good nutrition knowledge, why?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- We believe that most of non-professional nutritional sites are not qualified
2. Figures should be done by professional software, Tables not normal 3 line tables.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Tables were corrected according to required format.- Figures were attempted as required.
3. All online survey, although you have pointed out the Strength and Limitation, how can you affirm these survey was finished by themselves not by their children?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- We can never confirm whether the survey is finished by the mothers themselves not by their children unless the mother mentions that.
4. English should be more polish.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- - Done as advised and corrected highlighted.

Reviewer (2)

Reviewer's comments	Answer
1. The baseline characteristics of the parents and children was not fully presented in the manuscript, such as the gender of child, education level, income level, number of children, religion .	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- A table illustrating the baseline characteristics was added
2. As one of the key tools in this study is the 18-question questionnaire, however, how is the accuracy, reliability, and validity of the self-designed questionnaire was not fully presented.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- As advised, it was thoroughly presented and highlighted in the methods section as the following: Data collection tool accuracy, validity and reliability: A pretest was performed to confirm the content validity of the questions and assure the validity of the results. In order to eliminate common mistakes and unclear wording and to ensure that the questions were understandable, a panel of 50 volunteers from various backgrounds reviewed the question construction. The final version of the questionnaire was updated to include the expert panel's comments. The questionnaires were given out to the participants following this pilot study (pilot results were not included in the final results). Reliability internal test (Cronbach's) was done for the 18-item

	questionnaire (nutrition misinformation); where Cronbach's alpha was 0.76 (high reliability).
3. Statistical methods were not effectively and fully used in the study. For example, using the regression analyses to detect the independent risk factors.	<p>- Illustrated and highlighted as required in the statistical methods as the following:</p> <p>A binary logistic regression model was used to determine which source of knowledge could predict the likelihood of holding myths, and being more knowledgeable in nutrition.</p>