



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
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 (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The review introduces Facebook, Twitter, and LinkedIn as the most used sites, but then contains specific examples only relating to Facebook (this is probably because out of these, only "Facebook" was used in the search. See next comment). I'm left wondering, what are specific consequences of physicians using LinkedIn or Twitter for example? The methodology section could benefit from revision: how many articles were retrieved? How many of these articles were then further filtered? I'm surprised to read that the keyword "Twitter" was not used in the search but "Facebook" was.	To date, no relevant studies on social media other than Facebook have been conducted. A paragraph about it was added to the article. 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	Line 135: change "psysicians" to "physicians" Line 22: Facebook has 1300 million users worldwide. Are these <i>active</i> or <i>registered</i> users?	Line 135: It was changed Line 22: active (it was added)
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Many interesting facts are cited in the review. For example, it was interesting to know that Bosslet et al reported 34.5% of physicians receiving friend requests from their patients!	Thank you for your feedback.