PEER REVIEW HISTORY

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Factors associated with online victimization among Malaysian adolescents who use social networking sites: a cross-sectional study
AUTHORS	Marret, Mary; Choo, Wan Yuen

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Ursula Kenny National University of Ireland, Galway Ireland
REVIEW RETURNED	19-Jan-2017

GENERAL COMMENTS	Abstract The objective of the abstract needs to be re-organised. Currently it reads as: To determine the prevalence of online interpersonal victimization among Malaysian adolescents using social networking sites (SNS) and its association with patterns of SNS use, offline victimization, offline perpetration as well as parental conflict. I think it should be rephrased to the following for clarity: To determine the prevalence of online interpersonal victimization and its association with patterns of SNS use, offline victimization, offline perpetration and parental conflict, among Malaysian adolescents using social networking sites (SNS). Furthermore, in the methods section of the abstract, (row 20), the terminology "inquired about" is not scientifically appropriate. I would suggest perhaps using "examined/investigated" In the Results section of the abstract, the first sentence - that outline the number and age range of participants should be removed and included in the Methods section of abstract instead. In row 32 of the results section, I would rephrase the sentence to: Adolescents who engaged in perpetration behaviours online were 6 times more likely than X, to report xxxxx..... In the last line of the Results section, remove the word "more" as the sentence should read: "Those who were victimized offline or experienced parental conflict were twice as likely to report online victimization". In the first line of the conclusion, the word intervention should be plural. Introduction Your punctuation throughout the manuscript is very poor. Many of the sentences are very long, without any comma, please ensure that you check this throughout and insert commas where appropriate to facilitate easier reading. With respect to the introduction itself, or more concise and clearer reading I would rephrase the first sentence of the introduction to: "Electronic aggression enacted through a range of behaviors, perpetrated via computers, cellphones and other electronic devices

has been found to be a common experience among youth [1-3]".
The second sentence (rows 11-15) do not make sense. Please clarify what it is you mean.
In the third sentence of the introduction, the word "unwelcome" should read as unwelcomed, and the word "form" in the final sentence should read as "from". In relation to the US "surveys", you only alluded to the findings of one study, although you made reference to several studies. Please rectify this.
In the first sentence of the second paragraph (row 31) the phrase "in reference to" should be changed to "to describe"
In row 41, the words "through replication" can be removed.
In row 45. The term "round the clock" is not appropriate. Please rephrase.
Page 5, row 18, you refer to "some studies" – what type of studies are you referring to here – please add more detail.
Page 5, Row 41, instead of "available research" I would rephrase to either current or past research studies. IN the same sentence add the word "the" before the word "determinants".
Before you start to explain the objectives of the study – I think it would be worthwhile to discuss a theoretical framework that has been used in previous studies of this type – and explain the relevance/applicability of that framework to your study.
On page 6, row 17, change the sentence to "There is a lack of research exploring risks encountered by youth using digital communication from middle income Asian countries, such as Malaysia."
In the next line (row 20) the sentence is not clear to me – please rephrase.
The next sentence (row 25-35), the sentence is far too long and thus is not clear to me what point you are trying to make. Please ensure that your sentences are very concise and short.
With respect to Figure 1 – your theoretical framework – I would like an explanation with respect to its development i.e. how did you develop this framework? Please provide a rationale for why you constructed your framework in this manner.
Regarding your research questions, you have stated that they were "formulated" – who were they formulated by? How were they formulated? And have they been validated with other groups of youth prior to use in this study? In your third formulated question remove the word "if" and replace with "is"
In the introduction I would also like to know what age group you focused on – and the rationale for focusing on such an age group.
Methods
Sample.
Row 18 – use the word conducted in place of carried out. The latter part of this sentence does not make sense to me – I do not understand your rationale. Please rephrase to reflect a clearer rationale.
Again, the age range of your sample is not included in this section – please include.
Ethical considerations.
The first line of this section has a mistake – "the University fo" – instead of "the University of". Please rectify.
Statistical Analysis.
Row 25 – Missing data "for" rather than "of" – please change.
Row 28 – where the logistic regression is described is not clear- Please rephrase using clearer and shorter sentence.
Row 37 – please replace the word understand with the word "examine" and remove "beside demographic and SNS characteristics" – as there is no need for this.

	Results
	Row 56 – the sentence should read as follows:
	The 1,487 respondents were aged between 15 and 16 years of age; of which 53.9% were female. Please change.
	Page 10, row 8: include "of" before the words "their parents".
	Page 11, row 3, not clear – most commonly reported WHAT??
	Page 14, row 40 – please change to "were 6 times more likely" to report xxxx.
	Discussion
	Page 17, row 44, please rephrase sentence to: The high prevalence of SNS users and reported motivation for use found in this study, are consistent with studies in Europe and other local studies [47 50 53-55].
	Page 17, row 54, remove any and make the word "initiative" plural.
	Page 18 – row 41, no rationale has been given for this finding – please provide one.
	Page 18, row 51, why are boys more likely than girls to perpetrate online – please explain your rational better- as this is not consistent with other studies. Girls usually report greater online perpetration.
	Page 19, row 5 - provide a reference for this point.
	Page 19, row 34 – remove the word "here" and replace with "in this study".
	Page 20 – row 13 – the phrase "tipping point" is not appropriate – please rephrase.
	Page 20, row 15- "uploading personal revealing photographs and online perpetration were major contributors to risk" - risk to what? Please outline and make this sentence clearer.
	In the discussion – I think it would be nice to include whether you found differences between urban and rural schools? It would add a valuable contribution to your work. Please include if possible.
	Limitations.
	I think you need to add that your sample was predominantly Malay and thus the findings may be most applicable to this ethnic group. You also need to state that the age range of this sample was very narrow (15-16) and thus the findings may not be applicable to those from other rage categories? – Possibility for future research direction.

REVIEWER	Hayat AYAR
	Gebze Technical University
	Turkey
REVIEW RETURNED	01-Feb-2017

GENERAL COMMENTS	There are several issues that I see as problematic and limit the potential contribution of this paper in its current form:
	1) There is no literature review/theory section at all in this manuscript. Please craft an introduction that clarifies the purpose, positioning and intended contribution to motivate the reader, and present literature review/theory separately.
	2) Another, perhaps more severe notion is the lack of theoretical framework. There is a theoretical model (Fig. 1) and research questions but it is not clear how it is justified, i.e. why these concepts, and the conceptual relationships. Therefore, there should be first a theoretical frame where the research questions can be developed. Now there is a gap between theoretical discussion and theoretical model. Further, the conceptual definitions are not entirely presented/argued.
	3) In general, the discussion section is ok. To polish it, more

	reflection to earlier research as well as more concrete managerial implications could be provided. 4) Conclusions seems to meander around subjects without making any clear points or outcomes from the research. That section needs some improvements. 5) Please use some references from "BMJ" 6) There are some minor grammatical error. Therefore, it would benefit from further proof-reading to remove those errors. Good luck with revision

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Responses to Reviewer 1
Thank you for your comments.

Abstract
The objective of the abstract has been rephrased as suggested.
The term "inquired about" in the methods section has been rephrased to "examined" as suggested.
The number and age range or participants has been moved from the Results to the Methods section.
The sentence in row 32 of the results section has been rephrased as suggested.
The word "more" has been removed from the last line of the Results section.
The word intervention in the Conclusion has been changed to plural.

The text of the manuscript has been been reviewed and revised. The sentences have been shortened punctuation added to facilitate easier reading.

The first sentence of the introduction has been revised as suggested.
The content in the second sentence has been expanded to convey the meaning.
Amendments have been made to the third sentence as suggested.
Clarification has been made with regard to the "U.S. surveys" : in the quoted reference, a review had been made between results of a series of 3 separate surveys carried out over the span of a decade.
The phrase "in reference to" has been changed as suggested "to describe". This is now in the third paragraph of the revised introduction.
The words "through replication" (row 41 previously) have been removed.
The term "round the clock" has been changed to "at any time of the day or night"
With reference to "some studies" (page 5, row 18), more details have been added as suggested.
With reference to page 5, row 41, the amendments have been made as suggested.
In response to the suggestion to provide more background regarding previous studies / theory: The introduction has been revised with perspectives and findings of previous studies in paragraphs 4 to 8.
The sentence on page 6, row 17 has been amended as suggested.
The sentence in page , row 20 has been revised (see paragraph 10 of the revised introduction) for improved clarity.
The sentence following this (row 25-35) has been split to improve the clarity.
With respect to Figure 1, the intended meaning was "conceptual" rather than "theoretical" framework. This has been revised. This was constructed by the authors based on findings of previous studies discussed in paragraphs 5 to 8 of the revised introduction.
The research questions were constructed by the authors to address the study objectives. The sentence has been rephrased to "The following research questions were addressed". They were not validated with other groups of youth prior to the study. However a pilot study among smaller group of youth (not included in this study) was conducted prior to the main study.
The word "if" has been replaced with "is" in research question 3.
The focus was on older adolescents. A national Cybersafe programme mentioned in paragraph 9 of

the revised introduction identified older adolescents in Malaysia to be vulnerable to cyberbullying. Students in Form 4 (age 15-16) were selected as the age group accessible for survey. This was to comply with guidelines from the Malaysian Ministry of Education which permit studies to conducted on classes which are not preparing for major public examinations that year. Students in Form 3 and 5 are involved in public examinations and not permitted to participate.

Methods
Under sample in row 18, the word conducted has been substituted for carried out. The latter part of this sentence has been rephrased for clarity.
The age range of the sample has been added.

Ethical considerations
The typographical error "of" has been corrected.

Statistical analysis
Correction "for" has been made in row 23.
The sentence where logistic regression is described has been rephrased with shorter sentences.
The word understand has been replaced with examine in row 37 the latter phrase in the sentence removed as suggested.

Results
The sentence in row 56 has been changed as suggested.
In page 10, row 8, the word "of" has been added before "their parents".
In page 11, row 3, the sentence has been amended to read: Of these, the most commonly reported online behaviour was interacting with strangers while the posting of revealing images was least common.
The sentence in page 14, row 40 has been changed to "6 times more likely.." as suggested.

Discussion
Page 17, row 44: The sentence has been amended as suggested.
Page 18, row 41: a rationale has been provided.
Page 18, row 51: In our study, the findings were that boys experienced more victimization in the form of "online harassment" and were involved in more perpetration online compared to girls. As online perpetration (more common in boys) was an important predictor of online victimization in our study, we think this explains the gender differences in our study. The other predictor (posting revealing images) was also more common in boys. We acknowledge that this does not follow the more commonly observed patterns found in studies conducted in North America and Europe. It is possible that cultural differences may account for this as we have explained in the discussion.
page 19, row 5: references have been added
page 19, row 34: the word here has been replaced with "in this study"
page 20, row 13: the phrase "tipping point" has been replaced
page 20, row 15: the phrase "of online victimization" has been added for clarity
There were no differences in findings between urban and rural schools. This information has been added to the first paragraph of the results section under "Socio-demographic characteristics".

Limitations
Limitations regarding the age groups and ethnic groups has been added.

Responses to Reviewer 2
Thank you for your comments.

The introduction has been revised considerably with addition of a literature review and information

regarding the intended purpose and contribution of this study. Information regarding conceptual definitions, and how the conceptual framework was constructed based on the findings of previous studies has been added.

More reflection on earlier research has been added to the discussion section.
Both the discussion and conclusion have been revised with a clearer statement of outcomes and more concrete implications with regard to management.
The references were quoted based on available references that were relevant to the subject of the study. There were no such relevant references from BMJ.
The manuscript has been revised and proof-read to address the grammatical and typographical errors.