



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_12750
Title of the Manuscript:	Medicine and social media – ethical challenges of the 21st century
Type of the Article	Review 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	It should be argued why database research was limited to years 2008-2014, since social media has been discussed already since 2005 in academic literature. The description of methodology should be longer overall. For instance, how many relevant articles were discovered? What were the inclusion and/or exclusion criteria of the articles? Or were all articles included in the review that were found?	The methodology section was re-written and completed. A new search was done to confirm if all the relevant articles were used.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Based on the literature review, what are your recommendations for further research? Results and discussion seem to mostly discuss Facebook with other social networks, e.g. Twitter and LinkedIn only mentioned in Introduction (line 21). Is it because no articles in PubMed discuss Twitter, LinkedIn or other social networks besides Facebook, or did the authors only cherry-pick issues related to Facebook? The authors should make it explicit whether they chose to focus only on Facebook, or e.g. that existing research is only limited to Facebook. Pointing out research gaps, where research is currently limited can also be a contribution of this review article.	To date, no relevant studies on social media other than Facebook have been conducted. A paragraph about it was added to the article.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	A review article should typically present the literature review process, not only which database and search terms were used. For conducting a systematic literature review see e.g. Tranfield et al. (2003). Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., and Smart, P. 2003. "Towards a Methodology for Developing Evidence-Informed Management Knowledge by Means of Systematic Review," British Journal of Management (14:3), pp. 207-222. Also it could be mentioned why literature search was limited to PubMed database only, e.g. why PubMed database is suitable or a good choice for medicine and/or social media related fields.	Thank you for your recommendation.