



Adams, Clive E. and Jayaram, M. and Bodart, A.Y.M. and Sampson, S. and Zhao, S. and Montgomery, Alan A. (2016) Tweeting links to Cochrane Schizophrenia Group reviews: a randomised controlled trial. *BMJ Open*, 6 (3). e010509/1-e010509/7. ISSN 2044-6055 (In Press)

Access from the University of Nottingham repository:

<http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/31545/1/BMJ%20open%20submission%20with%20revisions%2008%2001%2016.pdf>

Copyright and reuse:

The Nottingham ePrints service makes this work by researchers of the University of Nottingham available open access under the following conditions.

- Copyright and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners.
- To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in Nottingham ePrints has been checked for eligibility before being made available.
- Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.
- Quotations or similar reproductions must be sufficiently acknowledged.

Please see our full end user licence at:

http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/end_user_agreement.pdf

A note on versions:

The version presented here may differ from the published version or from the version of record. If you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the repository url above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information, please contact eprints@nottingham.ac.uk

Tweeting links to Cochrane Schizophrenia Group reviews: a randomised controlled trial

Authors:

Adams CE,¹ Jayaram M,² Bodart AYM,¹ Sampson S,¹ Zhao S,³ Montgomery AA⁴

Institutional affiliation

1. Institute of Mental Health, University of Nottingham, UK
2. Melbourne Neuropsychiatry Centre, Department of Psychiatry, University of Melbourne and Melbourne Health, Australia
3. Systematic Review Solutions, China
4. Nottingham Clinical Trials Unit, University of Nottingham, UK

Corresponding author:

Dr Mahesh Jayaram, Senior Lecturer, Melbourne Neuropsychiatry Centre,
Department of Psychiatry, University of Melbourne, National Neuroscience Facility
Level 3, Alan Gilbert Building, 161 Barry St, Carlton Vic 3053, Australia

E-mail: Mahesh.Jayaram@unimelb.edu.au

Tel: +61 3 9035 8628

Keywords: Twitter, schizophrenia, randomised controlled trial, social media

Word Count: 2323

ABSTRACT

Objective: To assess the effects of using health social media on web activity.

Design: Individually randomised controlled parallel group superiority trial.

Setting: Twitter and Weibo.

Participants: 170 Cochrane Schizophrenia Group full reviews with an abstract and Plain Language Summary web page.

Interventions: Three randomly ordered slightly different 140 character or less messages, each containing a short URL to the freely accessible summary page sent on specific times on one single day. This was compared with no messaging.

Outcome: The primary outcome was web page visits at one week. Secondary outcomes were other metrics of web activity at one week.

Results: 85 reviews were randomised to the intervention and control arms each. Google Analytics allowed 100% follow up within one week of completion. Intervention and control reviews received a total of 1162 and 449 visits respectively (IRR 2.7, 95% CI 2.2 to 3.3). Fewer intervention reviews had single page only visits (16% vs 31%, OR 0.41, 0.19 to 0.88) and users spent more time viewing intervention reviews (geometric mean 76 vs 31 seconds, ratio 2.5, 1.3 to 4.6). Other secondary metrics of web activity all showed strong evidence in favour of the intervention.

Conclusion: Tweeting in this limited area of health care increases 'product placement' of evidence with the potential for that to influence care.

Trial Registration number: ISRCTN84658943.

Funding: This trial received no funding.

Strengths and limitations of this study

- This is the first randomised controlled trial that we are aware of evaluating the impact of Tweeting health-related web links on access to the target webpage and/or related webpages.
- This study quantifies the effects of Tweeting evidence and generates many questions for future research.
- We used free-to-use software with limited functionality – more sophisticated software may highlight more effects.
- We Tweeted links to large academic reviews focusing on one small area of health care to a relatively small 'following'. Different techniques of Tweeting, other areas of health care, and a broad set of followers could result in more impact.

INTRODUCTION

Cochrane (previously known as Cochrane Collaboration) has more than 37,000 contributors from around 130 countries. They work together to produce credible, accessible health information that is free from commercial sponsorship and other conflicts of interest. The Cochrane Schizophrenia Group (which is part of Cochrane) produces and maintains systematic reviews and meta-analyses of randomised trials that evaluate the effects of interventions for schizophrenia and related psychotic illnesses. Full text versions of this work can be accessed in some high income and most low income countries.¹ Each review also has an abstract and a Plain Language Summary to make the information in the review more accessible to people without specialised knowledge.² Both abstract and plain language summary are freely available from the Cochrane website.³

Twitter is a popular free to use social media platform which allows users to send a 140-character message (a 'tweet') to a group who has chosen to receive (or 'follow') these short messages from the sender. Currently there are 288 million monthly active users sending out 500 million tweets a day.⁴ Most (77%) accounts are outside the USA and 80% of tweets are sent from mobile devices. The use of Twitter in healthcare has increased, encompassing, for example, issues relating to public health surveillance, tracking disease activity of H1N1 pandemic and isolating the source of a cholera outbreak in Haiti.⁵⁻⁷ Health-related Twitter messages now comprise an estimated 0.0001% of all Twitter traffic.⁸ Most Cochrane Review Groups have recently developed this method of dissemination.⁹ However, an investment of effort is required to undertake this activity, and the potential benefits for review groups with limited numbers of reviews and followers are unclear.

Twitter and some other platforms are not available in China. However, 91% of China's population use social media compared to 67% of the population of the USA.¹⁰ The Cochrane Schizophrenia Group has been working with a Chinese company, Systematic Review Solutions Ltd,¹¹ to disseminate parallel messages on Weibo, a Twitter-like system, to their followers across China. Weibo is in the top ten social media sites used in China with over 600 million registered users, of which about 140 million use it regularly (as of March 2014).¹²

Given the increasing use of social media in healthcare, and the investment involved in doing this, we evaluated the impact of tweeting précis of Cochrane Schizophrenia Group systematic reviews.

METHODS

Study design

Prospective two-arm, parallel, open randomised controlled trial with a 1:1 allocation ratio. Protocol with full details of the study design has been published elsewhere.¹³

Participants

Participants included in this study were published full text Cochrane Schizophrenia Group systematic reviews in The Cochrane Library with Plain Language Summary (PLS) which are available for free at www.summaries.cochrane.org. We excluded published protocols for Cochrane Schizophrenia Group reviews, any Cochrane Schizophrenia Group review not relevant to schizophrenia, unpublished and withdrawn Cochrane Schizophrenia Group reviews.

This study was conducted entirely on the internet. The participant PLSs were all available on the Cochrane Library website, the intervention was delivered via two social media platforms (Twitter and Weibo) and outcome data were collected using Google Analytics.

This study did not involve any living participants and used information that is available in the public domain. Participants are *systematic reviews* rather than people and routine web activity data were extracted and recorded through Google Analytics. No ethical approval was required.^{13,14}

Randomisation

All participating Cochrane Schizophrenia Group systematic reviews were identified prior to randomisation. We defined mean baseline access activity as high (≥ 19 unique views per week, $n=14$), medium (4.3 to 18.99 unique views per week, $n=72$) or low (< 4.3 views unique per week, $n=84$) based on the 23 week period 21 September 2013 to 28 February 2014 (defined under heading sample size below). Reviews were given a unique code, which along with baseline activity stratum, was supplied to one of the authors (AAM) who performed the randomisation. Stratifying by baseline access activity, and using computer-generated random number sequences, reviews were first allocated to intervention and control arms, then into pairs of reviews that would have the same reference period for outcome data collection, then to day of the week and week number (1 to 29) that tweeting would take place for reviews in the intervention arm. Days for tweeting were Tuesday, Wednesday or Friday as these are considered to have the heaviest traffic.¹⁶ Finally the sequence of the three tweets for each review (the tweet package) in the intervention arm was also randomised. Tweets had been prepared for all reviews.

Once allocation codes were supplied to AB she, independent of other investigators, scheduled tweets for the intervention group within Hootsuite.

Procedures

Reviews in the intervention group were tweeted in English, by the Cochrane Schizophrenia Group, three times on the same day at 10:30, 13:00 and 15:00 GMT as guided by the SocialBro web tool,¹⁷ and eight hours later in China, in Mandarin, via Weibo. There is some evidence that multiple postings, 3-4 times a day, of the same or similar tweet can be useful for an international following.¹⁶ Each of the three tweets had different accompanying text:

- The review title as it appears in summaries.cochrane.org, and a shortened URL to the summaries web page.
- A pertinent extract from the results or discussion sections of the abstract, and a shortened URL to the summaries web page.
- An intriguing question or pithy statement directly related to the evidence presented in the abstract, and a shortened URL to the summaries web page (see Table 1).

Tweet 1	#Clozapine combined with different #antipsychotic #drugs for #treatment resistant #schizophrenia http://ow.ly/yaKAU
Tweet 2	How effective is #clozapine in addition to another #antipsychotics at treating 'hard to treat' #schizophrenia? http://ow.ly/yaKAU
Tweet 3	Not clear if combining #clozapine with other #antipsychotics is effective for #treatment resistant #schizophrenia http://ow.ly/yaKAU
Table 1: Example of the three tweets relating to same review	

We did not compare the specific content of the different types of accompanying text, which were formulated in order to appeal to various followers of the Cochrane Schizophrenia Group Twitter page and searchers. We compared the combined impact of the package of tweets versus no tweets. To assist the logistics of sending out tweets, we used Hootsuite, a social media management system.¹⁸ This free package allows formulation and scheduling of Tweets and is now available in China and integrates with Weibo (<http://blog.hootsuite.com/chinese-localization-weibo/>).

Reviews in the control group were not tweeted by the Cochrane Schizophrenia Group.

Outcomes

The primary outcome was the total number of visits to the relevant Cochrane summary page in the seven days following the intervention (including the day of tweeting) as reported on Google Analytics. The secondary outcomes are listed below in table 2.

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unique page views 2. Entrances 3. 100% of visits were single page 4. Direct click visits 5. Twitter referrals 6. Any outbound click events 7. Time on page in seconds
Table 2: List of secondary outcomes

For reviews in the control arm, the seven day follow up period was the same as for the intervention review with which it had been randomly paired. For the primary outcome, repeated views of the same page during a single user session are counted in the total; unique page views are a secondary outcome. The standard free account in Google Analytics produces various reports in real-time and provides data about whom, when and where someone has visited a site as well as how they 'arrived' at that site.^{19,20} Table 3 below outlines the glossary of Google Analytics terms.

This includes all traffic to the Cochrane summary page and traffic directly from Twitter. The average half-life of a tweet (with a web link), defined as *'the amount of time at which this link will receive half of the clicks it will ever receive after it's reached its peak'*, has been estimated as 2.8 hours.²¹ However, to capture any possible cascade effect of tweeting, we extended the monitoring period to seven days.²² Secondary outcomes provide other measures of incoming activity and exiting behaviour. In addition we recorded country distribution of users clicking on the target sites.

One week after the final Tweets were sent, four different data reports per review were downloaded from Google Analytics for each Cochrane summary page, for the

ISRCTN84658943

relevant seven day period. These 680 files were uploaded into an MS Access database and then merged for analysis.

Google term		Explanation	In lay terms
Direct clicks - traffic that does not originate from search-engine results or a referring link in a domain is identified as 'direct' ²³	Visits	Number of times people viewed the site	Direct hits on the specific Cochrane summaries (not overall Cochrane site hits) - without being directed via our Twitter. Here people have intentionally gone to the website to look at the summaries without our encouragement.
All clicks - the overview of all clicks onto the website of interest ²³	Page views*	Number of pages viewed. Repeated views of a single page are counted.	Once on the target (summaries) page a person can click around the site and back and forward to the page. So if they hit the target page, click to another within the site and then return to the target page – that = 3. This is the same as 'Direct-click Visits' but includes other ways people have got to the Cochrane summaries page e.g. directed via Twitter or urls they have clicked on from another website etc.
	Unique page views	Number of visits during which the specified page was viewed at least once. A unique page view is counted for each page URL + page Title combination.	The number of individual (non-duplicate) visits to the target (Cochrane summaries) page. This is similar to Page views but will also look at the IP address – counting it as one view from a computer even if the user accesses the page multiple times in the same session (30mins).
	Average time on page	Average amount of time visitors spend viewing a specified page or set of pages	This is the time spent on one web page – in this case the target (summaries) page. A website may have multiple web pages
	Entrances	Number of times visitors entered your site through a specified page or set of pages	This is the number of times someone entered the summaries page through the twitter page.
	Bounce rate	% of single-page visits (i.e. visits in which the person left the site from the entrance page without interacting with the page).	This may be an indication of getting what they need off the target (summary) page – or, alternatively – not getting anything they need and having no will to proceed. We converted this to binary for analysis 1=all visits were single page, 0-other
Twitter referrals - clicks originating from a third-party website where a web link links to the page of interest ^{24,25}	Page views	Number of pages viewed. Repeated views of a single page are counted.	The subset of 'All clicks target page views' – only ones from Twitter. This may include CSzG tweets, retweets or other Twitter's user tweets whereby the page url has been tweeted. We were also using Wiebo.
Events - An action tracked on the website – e.g. exit to Cochrane Library	Total events	Total Events is the number of times events occurred.	This is the total number of times an external link is clicked

Table 3: Glossary of Google Analytics terms

Statistical analysis

The sample size for this study is fixed by the number of published Cochrane reviews under the control of the Cochrane Schizophrenia Group (n=170). Therefore we estimated the magnitude of the detectable between-group difference in the primary outcome. Google Analytics data for all 170 reviews during the period 21 September 2013 to 28 February 2014 suggested that log transformed mean number of views per week is normally distributed, with mean of 1.5 and standard deviation of 0.9. With 5%

two-sided alpha and a sample size of 85 per arm, between-group differences in the range 0.43 to 0.5 standard deviations, equivalent to a ratio of geometric means 1.47 to 1.57, are detectable with 80-90% power.

The primary outcome is a count of the number of times that each review is accessed during its 7-day follow up period. Due to over-dispersion in this, and in other outcomes that are counts, we used multivariable negative binomial regression modelling to estimate incidence rate ratios and 95% confidence intervals, adjusted for baseline activity stratum and day of the week on which the 7-day data collection period commenced. We also investigated the use of mixed effects models to take account of pairing of intervention and control reviews. This made no material difference and so results from the simpler models are presented. Outcomes with excess zero counts were analysed using zero-inflated negative binomial regression models. Binary variables were analysed using logistic regression. Continuous variables were analysed using linear regression, with transformation of outcomes if appropriate.

We conducted further secondary analyses of the primary outcome. By including appropriate interaction terms in the primary regression model, we investigated in subgroup analyses whether any effect of the intervention differed according to baseline activity, or by day of the week that tweets were sent. The latter was not pre-specified before analysing the data and therefore should be regarded as exploratory. Finally, we estimated the effects of the intervention separately for visits to the review summaries that originated from China and from outside of China.

All between-group comparisons analysed reviews as randomised. As the intervention was delivered as intended, and there are no missing outcome data, sensitivity analyses were unnecessary.

Results

Following randomisation of 170 reviews, intervention group Tweets were posted between 1st July 2014 and 13th January 2015 between which participants (systematic reviews) were recruited as outlined in the trial profile (Figure 1). Reviews allocated to groups were evenly distributed within each activity stratum (high, medium, low) and this was reflected in the broad categorisation of review content (Table 4).




Figure 1: Trial profile

Category		Group	
		Non-tweet	Tweet
Participants	schizophrenia + additional issues	20 (24%)	13 (15%)
	schizophrenia	65 (76%)	72 (85%)
Intervention	Drug	59 (69%)	54 (64%)
	Non-drug	26 (31%)	31 (36%)

Table 4. Description of review by randomised group

Results are presented in Table 5 below.

	Control (n=85)	Intervention (n=85)	Crude estimate of effect	Adjusted ^a estimate of effect	95% CI	p- value
Primary outcome						
All page views						
Total	449	1162				
Incidence rate	5.28	13.67	2.59 ^b	2.71	2.20 to 3.33	<0.001
Secondary outcome						
Unique page views						
Total	403	1058				
Incidence rate	4.74	12.45	2.63 ^b	2.74	2.24 to 3.35	<0.001
Entrances						
Total	260	821				
Incidence rate	3.06	9.66	3.16 ^b	3.36	2.68 to 4.22	<0.001
100% of visits were single page						
No	53	71				
Yes	24	14	0.44 ^c	0.41	0.19 to 0.88	0.023
Direct click visits						
Total	26	168				
Incidence rate	0.31	1.98	6.46 ^b	6.74	4.11 to 11.08	<0.001
Twitter referrals						
Total	0	297				
Incidence rate	0	3.49	-	-	-	-
Any outbound click events						
No	60	39				
Yes	25	46	2.83 ^c	3.20	1.63 to 6.31	0.001
Time on page in seconds						
arithmetic mean (SD)	147 (232)	164 (210)				
median (min, max)	51 (0, 1283)	109 (0, 1610)				
geometric mean	31	76	2.42 ^d	2.47	1.32 to 4.61	0.005

Table 5 : Results

^a Adjusted for baseline activity and day of week

^b Incidence rate ratio

^c Odds ratio

^d Ratio of geometric means

For the primary outcome, there were 1162 and 449 visits in total to the 85 review summaries in the intervention and control arms respectively, and strong statistical evidence of a nearly three-fold increase in the intervention arm. There was further evidence of an effect of the intervention on all of the secondary outcomes.

There was no evidence that the intervention was differentially effective at increasing visits to reviews classified according to baseline activity as low (IRR 3.09, 95% CI 2.30 to 4.17), medium (IRR 2.65, 1.94 to 3.61), or high (IRR 1.85, 0.88 to 3.89) (overall p-value for interaction = 0.31). Nor was there any evidence of a differential effect according to day of the week that tweets were sent (p-value for interaction = 0.68).

The data did not suggest that the intervention was any more or less effective in China compared with the rest of the world. The incidence rate ratio for the primary outcome for visits that originated from China was 2.27 (95% CI 0.35 to 14.77), and 2.15 (1.73 to 2.68) from outside of China.

Discussion

Much investment is made into dissemination of healthcare evidence. Many choices are available to individuals, institutions and industry and it is difficult to estimate how much of this investment is misplaced. We were able to show that a simple approach on a commonly used set of systems was possible i. to evaluate; and ii. seemed to have some effect.

There are many more questions on the effects of types of social media targeting and how best to undertake this in order to encourage best evidence being implemented. Much more sophisticated outcome analytics are available beyond what we used which would add to understanding of how best to target for substantive encouragement of behaviour for best impact.

All hit rates, by whatever method of measurement were, largely modest. The degree of effect was consistently substantial but is relative to the modest standard activity. Without our social media activity many of the Cochrane reviews have little or no activity within the target week. The social media activity changes this and there are some indications that the intervention also changed how a person interacts with the site. The user would stay longer, 'bounce off' less frequently and exit to another site more frequently. We did not specially investigate if people tended to exit to the full Cochrane Review as access to the full text vary across countries. This study underlines the importance of this summaries web interface for the Cochrane

Collaboration. The activities, however, increased by the social media intervention, would seem to indicate improved interest.

This is the first randomised controlled trial that we are aware of evaluating the impact of Tweeting health-related web links on access to the target webpage and/or related webpages. This study quantifies the effects of Tweeting evidence and generates many questions for future research. We used free-to-use software with limited functionality – more sophisticated software may highlight more effects. We Tweeted links to large academic reviews focusing on one small area of health care to a relatively small ‘following’. Different techniques of Tweeting, other areas of health care, and a broad set of followers could result in more impact.

Use of social media in an area of health care that is not particularly high profile, for dissemination of evidence that is highly specialised through a small following, nevertheless, seemed to have a genuine effect by which indicators of interest were increased. Visits to the target site were more and the time spent on the page longer. We cannot tell if that interest translated into better care more in line with best evidence but ‘product placement’ of good evidence is a significant step in the right direction.

Conclusions

Use of social media in an area of health care that is not particularly high profile, for dissemination of evidence that is highly specialised through a small following, nevertheless, seemed to have a genuine effect by which indicators of interest were increased. Visits to the target site were more and the time spent on the page longer. We cannot tell if that interest translated into better care more in line with best evidence but ‘product placement’ of good evidence is a significant step in the right direction.

Much effort is expended in disseminating health-related messages across social media with unclear effect. The Cochrane Schizophrenia Group, based in the University of Nottingham, has randomised their reviews to be also disseminated by social media compared with no additional ‘Tweeting’/‘Weibo-ing’]. There is now evidence from a trial that low-grade social media dissemination is powerful for ‘product placement’ of health information.

Article summary

Article focus

- We initially identified the helpful and comprehensive review²⁶ and supplemented this with a further literature search (July 2015).
- There are no other identified randomised trials of any social media. As has already been noted²⁶ there is much analysis of social media and its potential for impact but none directly randomising to quantify its effects.
- We aimed to investigate the effects of using social media (Twitter and Weibo) on web activity.
- This randomised controlled trial provides a model for future trials using social media.

Key messages

- This trial illustrates how free-to-use software can be used in evaluative studies and how the effects of targeted, stylised short health messages can be quantified.
- The trial suggests that investment in targeted short health messages in social media allows effective placement of best evidence which affords some behaviour change.

Acknowledgements

We are really grateful to Constanze Knahl, student on the EU Erasmus Student Exchange from Neu-Ulm University of Applied Sciences, Ulm, Germany, who constructed the MS Access upload tool without which this study would have been much more difficult.

Contributors

CEA wrote the first draft and all authors revised drafts. MJ helped extract data from Google Analytics. AB helped allocate with categorising the reviews and setting up Hootsuite. AAM conducted the statistical analyses. SZ is co-ordinating the China arm of the trial and contributed to revising the manuscript. SS contributed to drafting the protocol and revisions. All authors are accountable for accuracy and integrity of the work. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Sponsorship and Funding

No funding was provided for this trial. The trial was sponsored by the Nottinghamshire Mental Health Trust.

Transparency declaration

The lead author (the manuscript's guarantor) affirms that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted.

Competing interests

None. All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form.

Ethics approval

This study does not involve any living participants and uses information that is available in the public domain. Participants are *systematic reviews* rather than people and routine web activity data were extracted and recorded through Google Analytics. No ethical approval was required.

Data sharing statement

The full dataset and statistical code is available from the corresponding author. We will upload the data on to the University of Nottingham server from where it will be made freely available.

REFERENCES

1. The Cochrane Library. 2015. <http://www.cochranelibrary.com/> (accessed May 1, 2015).
2. McIlwain C, Santesso N, Simi S, Napoli M, Lasserson T, Welsh E, et al. Standards for the reporting of Plain Language Summaries in new Cochrane Intervention Reviews (PLEACS) 2014. <http://consumers.cochrane.org/PLEACS> (accessed May 1, 2015).
3. Cochrane Summaries. 2014. <http://www.cochrane.org/search/site> (accessed May 1, 2015).
4. Twitter. Our mission, Twitter About. 2014. <https://about.twitter.com/company> (accessed May 1, 2015).
5. Chew C, Eysenbach G. Pandemics in the age of Twitter: content analysis of Tweets during the 2009 H1N1 outbreak. *PloS One* 2010;**5**(11):e14118.
6. Chunara R, Andrews JR, Brownstein JS. Social and news media enable estimation of epidemiological patterns early in the 2010 Haitian cholera outbreak. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* 2012; Jan;**86**(1):39–45.
7. Collier N, Son NT, Nguyen NM. OMG U got flu? Analysis of shared health messages for bio-surveillance. *J Biomed Semant* 2011;**2** Suppl 5:S9.
8. Dredze M, Paul M. You Are What You Tweet: Tracking Public Health Trends from Twitter Messages. 2011. <http://releases.jhu.edu/2011/07/06/tracking-public-health-trends-from-twitter-messages/> (accessed May 1, 2015).
9. Rader T, Pardo Pardo J, Stacey D, Ghogomu E, Maxwell LJ, Welch VA, et al. Update of strategies to translate evidence from cochrane musculoskeletal group systematic reviews for use by various audiences. *J Rheumatol* 2014 Feb;**41**(2):206–15.
10. Go-Globe. Social Media In China - Statistics and Trends. GO-Globe. 2013. <http://www.go-globe.com/blog/social-media-china/> (accessed May 1, 2015).
11. Xia J. Systematic Review Solutions Ltd. 2014. <http://en.review-solutions.cn/index.htm> (accessed May 1, 2015).
12. Smith C. 40 Amazing Weibo Statistics. 2015. <http://expandedramblings.com/index.php/weibo-user-statistics/> (accessed May 1, 2015).
13. Jayaram M, Bodart A, Sampson S, Zhao S, Montgomery A, Adams CE. To tweet or not to tweet about schizophrenia systematic reviews (TweetSz): study protocol for a randomised controlled trial. *BMJ Open* 2015;**5**:e007695 doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2015-007695.

14. Taylor P. When is approval needed? 2011. <http://www.orei.unimelb.edu.au/content/when-approval-needed> (accessed May 1, 2015).
15. NHS Health Research Authority, Medical Research Council. Do I need NHS REC approval? 2013. <http://www.hra-decisiontools.org.uk/ethics/> (accessed May 1, 2015).
16. Batra A. Best Time to Tweet? - Web Analytics, Behavioral Targeting and Optimization. 2010. <http://webanalysis.blogspot.co.uk/2010/07/best-time-to-tweet.html#axzz2qdk2Y69r> (accessed May 1, 2015).
17. Social Bro – The #1 marketing platform for Twitter. 2015. <http://www.socialbro.com/> (accessed May 1, 2015).
18. Cetin M. The Beginner's Guide to HootSuite [Internet]. Mashable. 2013 Available from: <http://mashable.com/2013/09/18/hootsuite-beginners-guide/> (accessed May 1, 2015).
19. Google Team. Google Analytics. 2014. Available from: <http://www.google.com/analytics/> (accessed May 1, 2015).
20. Bell K. Purpose of Google Analytics. Business & Entrepreneurship - azcentral.com. 2014. Available from: <http://yourbusiness.azcentral.com/purpose-google-analytics-6390.html> (accessed May 1, 2015).
21. Mason H. Time Is On Your Side. 2012. Available from: <http://blog.bitly.com/post/22663850994/time-is-on-your-side> (accessed May 1, 2015).
22. Kupavskii A, Ostroumova L, Umnov A, Usachev S, Serdyukov P, Gusev G, et al. Prediction of retweet cascade size over time. Proceedings of the 21st ACM international conference on Information and knowledge management. ACM Press; 2012. p. 2335–8. Available from: <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?doid=2396761.2398634> (accessed May 1, 2015).
23. Google Support. All Traffic. Acquisition reports. 2013. https://support.google.com/analytics/answer/1247833?hl=en-GB&ref_topic=1631856 (accessed May 1, 2015).
24. Crestodina A. Inaccurate Google Analytics Traffic Sources. 2013. Available from: <http://www.orbitmedia.com/blog/inaccurate-google-analytics-traffic-sources/> (accessed May 1, 2015).
25. Moczynski A. Google Analytics Terms, Defined. 352 Inc - Blog. 2013. http://www.352inc.com/blog/google-analytics-terms-defined/?utm_source=www.352media.com (accessed May 1, 2015).
26. Williams SA, Terras M, Warwick C. How Twitter Is Studied in the Medical Professions: A Classification of Twitter Papers Indexed in PubMed. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4084770/> (accessed July 13, 2015).

