

# Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/aes-23-74>

## Reviewer A

Thank you for your submission and efforts in delving into the interesting and growing topic of social media and its role in healthcare.

**Reply 1:** We thank you for your kind words, for the time and knowledge to review our manuscript

**Changes in the text:** Changes are highlighted in green

The paper primarily discusses the role of social media in health professions education, with a particular focus on ophthalmology. However, the connection between social media use and specific educational outcomes in ophthalmology is not robustly established. The relevance to ophthalmological education needs to be more explicitly addressed.

**Reply:** We aimed to craft a manuscript that could be useful for the medical educator in general and organized in accordance. So, searched for evidence to support it

-Learning theories sustaining the role of SoMe in learning

-Integration of SoMe in learning and teaching

-Key elements for successful integration of SoMe in Health Professions Education.

To address this aspect we advanced a search in PubMed, explained our strategy illustrated by a new table, and included a subsection entitled “ Methodology”, as per the AES journal guidelines indicate. We also added a new subsection SoMe in

**Changes in the text:** We added the following paragraph:

“Sterling M et al<sup>1</sup> underscored the importance of conducting more comprehensive research to better understand the impact of SoMe on postgraduate medical education, recruitment, and professionalism as the quality of existing studies is modest at best.

Guckian et al<sup>2</sup>. emphasized the positive impact of SoMe on medical students associated with communication improvement with educators and with both objective and self-reported learning improvement. On the other hand, they noted a lack of clear evidence regarding long-term retention of knowledge and occasionally negative impacts on mental and physical health”.

In the last paragraph of the introduction we added...” and addressed the relevance of SoMe in ophthalmic education”...

We included the subheading

SoMe in Ophthalmic Education under the heading: Main Body

We created the section “Methods”, which includes Table 1, as recommended by the

AES journal

“Our article stems from our participation as faculty in the online Teaching Skills Series of the Ophthalmology Foundation<sup>3,4</sup>. To draw an overview of SoMe in HPE, we elected four landmark reviews<sup>3,4,6,7</sup>. To highlight the role of SoMe in ophthalmology education we conducted a literature review in PubMed and retrieved 160 articles from which 110 were rejected for not being related to the topic (Social media AND ophthalmology), not English written, or no abstract available. Table 1

Additionally, while the paper references various studies on social media in health education, it lacks a thorough examination of literature specifically related to ophthalmology. Inclusion of more targeted research in this field would strengthen the paper's relevance and depth.

**Reply:** We did so as explain above

**Changes in the text:** The bibliography grew up to 100 citations to include targeted research in the field of ophthalmology

The paper would benefit from a more detailed explanation of the methodology used in analyzing the impact of social media on educational outcomes in ophthalmology. This includes a clearer definition of metrics for evaluating effectiveness. The inclusion of specific case studies or examples of social media use in ophthalmological education would provide practical insights and enhance the applicability of the findings.

**Reply:** We thank the review and advanced into a narrative review within the field of SoMe in ophthalmology education as recommended. We keep our experience and views supported by evidence. We explain that our manuscript stemmed from the Teaching Skills Series of the Ophthalmology Foundation.

**Changes in the text:** We built Table 1 following the recommendation of AES journal regarding narrative reviews, and explain the search strategy on Medline via PubMed® and the syntax used

The paper touches on ethical considerations briefly, but a more in-depth discussion on this aspect, especially in the context of patient privacy and professional standards in ophthalmology, is necessary.

Recommendations for Revision:

- Please clearly define the connection between social media and ophthalmological education. Include specific examples or case studies.

**Reply:** We provide several examples of the applicability of SoMe in ophthalmology education

**Changes in the text:** “Change in text highlighted in green in the new section SoMe in Ophthalmology”

- Integrate more targeted literature on social media's role in ophthalmology.

**Reply:** We increased our references to 100 to include a targeted bibliography regarding SoMe in Ophthalmology

**Changes in the text:** The references section grew from the initial 35 citations to 100 citations

- Provide a more detailed description of the methods used for analysis.

**Reply:** We included two new subsections: “Methods” as above written

**Changes in the text:** Change in text highlighted in green

- Elaborate on the ethical considerations of using social media in ophthalmological education, focusing on patient privacy and professional conduct.

**Reply:** We also focus on challenges regarding ethical issues and the use of SoMe in healthcare and health professions education

**Changes in the text:** As an example, we mention

“SoMe medical content, it becomes imperative to ensure accurate information dissemination<sup>5,6</sup>. Establishing formalized SoMe policies within training programs is essential to guide responsible usage and uphold professional standards. Regulatory bodies and healthcare organizations can play a crucial role in this effort by collaborating with ophthalmologists to establish guidelines and implement measures to regulate and monitor SoMe content<sup>7,8</sup>. While harnessing SoMe in ophthalmology, professionals should consider the required time, the inherently public nature of interactions, and potential misinformation as a challenge for both ophthalmologists and their patients<sup>36,9</sup>”

- If possible, I recommend inclusion of more robust data analysis to support claims and conclusions.

**Reply:** New citations were added focusing on the field of SoMe and ophthalmology education

**Changes in the text:** The perspectives selected to explore the role of SoMe in health professions education were supported by a bibliography and we have four systematic/scoping reviews also to support our claims.

Encouraged by the present review, we conducted a structured review in PubMed regarding the role of SoMe in ophthalmology education.

## **Reviewer B**

General remarks--

What an idea! I appreciate the tie-in of SoMe into HPE from a theory-meets-application-based approach. I haven't seen this in the literature yet in this fashion, and think it brings a new and innovative thought to the body of knowledge with practical implications. This article is what it says it is (i.e., "groundwork"), and gives a solid overview.

There is a culture of resistance to change, even with all that has happened during the pandemic, in many aspects of HPE from academic leaders. However, the pandemic has highlighted the critical need to re-think how we approach HPE. Otherwise, healthcare

education and clinical practice will fall. Badly -- it is that simple. Multiple generations of physicians may relate to this topic, and I think it encourages motivation for future validation studies.

Minor specific edits are recommended below. Thank you for the opportunity to review your manuscript!

**Reply:** We thank the good words of the reviewer and the knowledge shared

**Changes in the text:** All suggestions were acknowledged and addressed judiciously. With all reviews done the locations of such changes may not maintain the same, they are however all highlighted in yellow

Minor specifics --

page 2, line 45: please put a space between "of" and "appropriate"

**Reply:** Correction addressed

**Changes in the text:** This was addressed in the abstract

page 3, line 64: this instead -- "...ways of communication, such as text, images, sounds, and videos." Then start a new paragraph, beginning with "Research confirming...". This will break up this section a bit more.

**Reply:** Correction addressed

**Changes in the text:** We wrote as advised and started a new paragraph starting by "Research confirming..."

page 3, line 66: this instead -- "A review of 14 selected studies by Cheston et al.<sup>3</sup> in 2013 shows that SoMe may enable competency improvement and provide..."

**Reply:** Instead of "A review conducted by Cheston et al.<sup>10</sup> in 2013, selected 14 studies showing that SoMe enabled competency improvement and provided" we wrote as kindly suggested

**Changes in the text:** "A review of 14 selected studies by Cheston et al.<sup>3</sup> in 2013 shows that SoMe may enable competency improvement and provide..."

page 4, line 70: Chan et al. reference? 4 or 5?

**Reply:** The reference was moved next to the name

**Changes in the text:** Chan et al.<sup>11</sup>

page 4, line 87: "We critically reviewed recent literature..." How so? Is this a qualitative review (i.e., "Recent literature was qualitatively reviewed for relevance to this topic...")?...a systematic review?...a scoping review?...etc.

**Reply:** Instead of "(.)"?... We critically reviewed recent literature)

**Changes in the text:** "We conducted a narrative review of recent literature on this topic"

page 5, line 108: Myself and many others know what X is, but it may be nice to say it like this for those who are still not aware of Twitter's transition to X (or in denial of it) -- "...microblogs like X (formerly Twitter), can..."

**Reply:** Correction addressed

**Changes in the text:** “microblogs like X former Twitter,”

page 7, lines 142-143: this instead -- "SoMe link people and information together, and support ongoing interactions and virtual CoPs."

**Reply:** Correction addressed

**Changes in the text:** ...” people and information together, and support”...

page 7, lines 153-156: this instead -- "...Gernstein model<sup>21</sup>, and four developmental stages of the web match the evolution of technology to meet the evolving philosophies of education."

**Reply:** Correction addressed

**Changes in the text:** Gernstein model<sup>12</sup> and the four developmental stages of the web match the evolution of technology to meet the evolving philosophies of education."

New paragraph -- "They are described as follows:..."

**Reply:** Correction addressed

**Changes in the text:** A new paragraph started with “They...” was created

page 8, line 168: I LOVE THIS LINE! YES! Do you have a reference for it? I see the quotations. If you thought of this line on your own, kudos. Well done. If there should be a reference, please be sure to include it.

**Reply:** Educators are learning facilitators, “guides on the side,” as opposed to "sages on the stage."

**Changes in the text:** We added the following reference: Jessani NS, Hendricks L, Nicol L, Young T. University Curricula in Evidence-Informed Decision Making and Knowledge Translation: Integrating Best Practice, Innovation, and Experience for Effective Teaching and Learning. *Front Public Health*. 2019 Dec 3;7:313. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2019.00313. PMID: 31850294; PMCID: PMC6901672.

page 9, line 196: what is going on with the 24,...,25. in text reference? Error? this message comes up again in page 10, line 236. Please address.

**Reply 1:** We reviewed references

**Changes in the text:** In line

183 the reference is 24

190 references are 24 and 25

196 references are cross-referenced 16, 17 and 18

207 references are 27 and cross-references 3 and 16