



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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 article	Review Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The authors have improved and revised the paper according to the review comments. From the revised paper only sentence one sentence remains unclear: “The information is not given to a particular patient, for a certain reason, directly by the physician and starts to be available to any patient who looks for it.[16]”. After reading the original source (However, information disclosed online about a doctor’s personal illness, relationship difficulties, wedding plans, religion or dying parent is potentially available to any patient who chooses to look for it. The effect, positive or negative, of such information on an individual patient cannot be predicted. In effect, information can be ‘taken’ by any patient, rather than deliberately ‘given’ in a considered manner, to a particular patient, for a particular reason, by the doctor.), I would rephrase this sentence e.g. in the following manner: “For example, information given to particular patient online, for a certain reason, starts to be available to any patient who looks for it”. (Lines 123-125). As final minor detail comment, in the line 226, LinkedIn is spelled incorrectly (Linkdln).	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jari Jussila
Department, University & Country	Department of Information Management and Logistics, Tampere University of Technology, Finland