**Appendix**:

|  |
| --- |
| **Please tell us about yourself.** |
| 1. What is your level of training? | Resident[ ]  | Fellow[ ]  | Faculty[ ]  | Other or Not Applicable [ ]  |
| 2. What discipline or specialty are you in?  |  |
| 3. What were you hoping to gain from participating in the JHM Tweet Chat? |  |
| **Please indicate your level of agreement with the following:** |
| **As a RESULT of participating in the JHM Twitter Journal Club (JHMChat), please rate your agreement with the following statements:** | Not Applicable | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neither Agree nor Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 4. I felt that the Twitter venue allowed me to discuss my manuscript with enough depth for participants to capture a good picture of what we did (e.g. implementation processes and challenges, ways to overcome challenges, and creating culture change). | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. The JHMChat provided me with an opportunity to share my work with a different group of participants than with whom I routinely interact with. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. The questions that were brought up by the moderator or listeners during the JHMChat helped me consider how I discuss my manuscript in the future. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. I believe that the discussion during the JHMChat was informative to other participants. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. I believe that by participating in the JHMChat, my manuscript achieved greater dissemination and visibility. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. Overall, the JHMChat was a valuable experience for me.  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **As a result of being part of the JHM Twitter Journal Club (JHMChat), please answer the following:** |
| 10. Did you create connections with other participants during the JHMChat? | Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_ |
| 11. What suggestions do you have that would improve the JHMChats in the future? |  |
| 12. Is there anything else you’d like to share about the JHMChat? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Article Title** | **Participating Author; Number of followers** |
| Nebulized bronchodilators instead of metered-dose inhalers for obstructive pulmonary symptoms | Chris Moriates; 2,694 |
| Urinary fractional excretion indices in the evaluation of acute kidney injury | Amit Pahwa; 300 |
| Updates in perioperative medicine | Kurt Pfeifer; 184 |
| As-needed intravenous antihypertensive therapy and blood pressure control | Robert Mahoney; 1,246 |
| The hospitalist perspective on opioid prescribing: A qualitative analysis and Opening the black box of inpatient opioid prescribing | Shoshana Herzg; 314 |
| Residents self-report on why they order perceived unnecessary inpatient laboratory tests | Mina Sedrak; 962 |
| Inpatient inherited thrombophilia testing\* | Chris Petrilli; 234 |
| Cost of acute kidney injury in hospitalized patients\* | Joel Topf; 10,376 |
| Standardized attending rounds to improve the patient experience: a pragmatic cluster randomized controlled trial\* | Brad Monash; 283 |
| Perceived safety and value of inpatient “very important person” services\* | Josh Allen-Dicker; 474 |
| Practical framework for understanding and reducing medical overuse\* | Deb Korenstein; 37 |
| Rates, predictors, and variability of interhospital transfers: A national survey\* | Steph Mueller; 80 |
| Techniques and behaviors associated with exemplary inpatient general medicine teaching: A qualitative analysis\* | Sanjay Saint; 2,195 |
| Against Medical Advice Discharges\* | David Alfandre; 63 |
| [What’s the Purpose of Rounds? A Qualitative Study Examining the Perceptions of Faculty and Students](http://www.journalofhospitalmedicine.com/jhospmed/article/149985/hospital-medicine/whats-purpose-rounds-qualitative-study-examining)\* | Jeanne Farnan; 1,203 |

**Appendix. Table 1.** **Participating authors and respective followers on Twitter.**