

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_105303
Title of the Manuscript:	The Impact of a Twitter-supplemented Educational Intervention to Promote Training in Social Determinants of Health Among Medical Residents
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The article is relevant for the scientific community and for the teaching community in particular, based on the findings found and the way in which its discussion is presented.</p> <p>Y.</p> <p>Y. We suggest improving the summary of interventions</p> <p>Y.</p> <p>Y. The study evidences adequate research and analysis methods. The writing is appropriate to the scientific text.</p> <p>Y.</p> <p>The objective in the introductory epigraph is suggested to be formulated in the form of a projection. In the methods, in the description of the population it is suggested to express the data of the number of people by gender. As there are differences between the interventions in the number of women, a comparison could be useful that could reveal if there was any kind of gender influence in the study.</p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>Yes, we consider it appropriate.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Reynaldo Alonso Reyes</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad de Camagüey, Cuba</b>