

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>)

Review Form 1.7

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>YES</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. Why randomization was not done in residents of Internal medicine ?</p> <p>2. There is significant difference in number of participants in both the groups, please explain why?</p> <p>3. Table or a bar diagram should have been made for results comparing between traditional journal club and tweeterial methods.</p> <p>4. In Table 6, why have number of participants reduced in both the groups. Also the footnote provided is not explanatory.</p> <p>5. Please see the manuscript, the places where changes is required is highlighted in yellow and my comments are in green.</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Surabhi Gupta
Department, University & Country	Subharti Medical College, SVSU, India