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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This a study carried out to test the following hypothesis "...many high-impact gastroenterologists don't have a significant social media presence, which limits their outreach and popularity among the public despite significant scholarly work". I have the following comments and questions:

1. Title: Is the question used in the title misleading?
2. Abstract: The Background section is not a very accurate summary based on what is described in the Introduction. There is a typo in the Results section (3. Introduction: Has the K index been validated somehow as a good metric for "celebrity status"? If yes, please cite. If not, it would be good to mention it.
4. Materials and Methods: Why were only practicing gastroenterologists affiliated with the Top 100 hospitals included? Is this a biased group? How was scientific contribution defined? Is the number of citations by itself an accurate metric of scientific contribution?
5. Results: It would be good to provide a deeper analysis of the followership of those gastroenterologists with a higher K index. "What is the minimum number of followers that a gastroenterologist on Twitter needs to be considered 'popular'?
Which were the hospitals with more high K index gastroenterologists? Was there any correlation between K index and the Top 100
hospitals ranking? 6. Discussion: Why didn't the authors start this section with "Few gastroenterologists..."? I would suggest to further discuss how the number of followers impact on the quality of the followership (Côté et al. Scientists on Twitter: Preaching to the choir or singing from the rooftops? https://doi.org/10.1139/facets-2018-0002) and how tweeting a paper improves citations (Luc et al. Does Tweeting Improve Citations? One-Year Results From the TSSMN Prospective Randomized Trial 10.1016/j.athoracsur.2020.04.065.
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### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This manuscript should be a letter to the editor or a comment instead of a research paper. If you search the term K-index in PubMed, you will find that there are only 13 papers, meaning that this topic was not quite interesting for the scientific community. Moreover, the authors used only a Twitter platform to evaluate the popularity of gastroenterologists, but there are so many social media platforms that the authors did not mention, such as Facebook, Youtube, TikTok, etc. Hence, the popularity of gastroenterologists only on a Twitter platform could not represent total popularity. The English grammar needed to be substantially polished. The citation pattern is not correct. The references were not in journal format.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The article is within the scope of the journal, and deals with an interesting topic. It is well written and well organized. The reading is fluent. However, there are some aspects that need to be improved: 1) A section on the state of the art must be included. 2) The materials and methods should be better explained. The proposed experiment is not clear. 3) It should be explained better why the result obtained justifies the conclusions reached. It is not clear. 4) The discussion should be improved, comparing the work presented with other similar works and showing the progress and limitations of the work. 5) The conclusions should summarize the scientific contribution of the work.
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