

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.journalcjust.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>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>The manuscript is important for the scientific community. This study tried to find the effectiveness of commonly used social media tool as a supplementary educational tool in advancing the knowledge among medical residents. The study conclusion that Tweetorials could be an alternative for the traditional journal club, there is scope for further studies to confirm the effectiveness.</p> <p>Title is suitable Yes. But the study design was mentioned there as mixed methods. Elsewhere in the manuscript there is no evidence to support the study design.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The only clarification needed is in the study design. If it is a mixed method study design where is the qualitative component? What is the theory based on which the study was done and what type of mixed method was planned need to be elaborated.</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are few spelling mistakes and grammatical corrections that need to be done. Example :Last line of introduction</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Good intervention.</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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	T. S. Gugapriya
Department, University & Country	AIIMS, India