

Quality assessment of studies using content analysis techniques [1-3] included:

- Data: appropriateness to research question, data corpus, sampling unit, unit of analysis and sampling plan (described and justified)
- Coding schema: appropriateness of approach, development, coders, training, theoretical underpinning of categories and reliability of coding schema
- Analysis: appropriateness of approach

References	Approach	RQ	Data corpus	Sampling unit	Unit of analysis	Sampling plan	Appropriate approach	Development	Coders	Training	Theoretical underpinning of categories	Reliability	Appropriateness of approach	Overall score
<u>Berman 1996</u> [4]	deductive	✓	✓	×	×	✓	✓	×	×	×	×	×	×	✓
<u>Bowers 1997</u> [5]	Inductive	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	✓	×	✓	✓
<u>Cervantez Thompson 2002</u> [6]	deductive	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	×	✓	×	✓	✓
Whitaker 2003 [7]	deductive	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
<u>Smith 2004</u> [8]	deductive	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	×	×	✓	×	✓	✓
<u>(Rodriguez-Recio 2007)</u> [9]	deductive	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓	✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓	×	×	✓	×	×	✓

References	Approach	RQ	Data corpus	Sampling unit	Unit of analysis	Sampling plan	Appropriate approach	Development	Coders	Training	Theoretical underpinning of categories	Reliability	Appropriateness of approach	Overall score
<u>Morken 2009</u> <u>[10]</u>	Inductive	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓
<u>Foong 2010</u> <u>[11]</u>	deductive	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	x	x	x	✓	x	x	✓
<u>Abrahamson 2013</u> <u>[12]</u>	Inductive	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Matta 2014 <u>[13]</u>	deductive	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	x	x	x	✓	x	x	✓
<u>Murray 1996</u> <u>[14]</u>	Inductive	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓
<u>Long 2009</u> <u>[15]</u>	Inductive	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
<u>Macdonald 2009</u> <u>[16]</u>	deductive	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓✓
<u>Chaudhry 2012</u> <u>[17]</u>	deductive	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓
<u>Hajar 2014</u> <u>[18]</u>	inductive	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	x	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓

References	Approach	RQ	Data corpus	Sampling unit	Unit of analysis	Sampling plan	Appropriate approach	Development	Coders	Training	Theoretical underpinning of categories	Reliability	Appropriateness of approach	Overall score
Canvasser 2015 [19]	deductive	✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Awad 2015 [20]	deductive	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
<u>Mishori 2014 [21]</u>	deductive	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
<u>Reutzel 2001[22]</u>	deductive	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓
<u>Brooks 2006a [23]</u>	deductive	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓
<u>Brooks 2006b[24]</u>	deductive	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓
<u>Hara 2007[25]</u>	Inductive	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓
<u>Hew 2007 [26]</u>	Inductive	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓
<u>Burg2012 [27]</u>	Inductive	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓

References	Approach	RQ	Data corpus	Sampling unit	Unit of analysis	Sampling plan	Appropriate approach	Development	Coders	Training	Theoretical underpinning of categories	Reliability	Appropriateness of approach	Overall score
<u>Desai 2012</u> [28]	deductive	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓✓
<u>McKendrick 2012</u> [29]	deductive	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓
<u>Murty 2012</u> [30]	Inductive	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓
<u>Neill 2014</u> [31]	deductive	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓
<u>Brynolf 2013</u> [32]	deductive	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓
<u>Kim</u> [33]	deductive	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓

## References

1. Krippendorff K. Content analysis: an introduction to its methodology. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, California, USA.: SAGE; 2004. ISBN:978-0-7619-1545-4
2. Zhang Y, Wildemuth BM. Qualitative analysis of content, In B.M. Wildemuth, editors. Applications of social research methods to questions in information and library science. Westport. Libraries Unlimited. 2009 p. 308-319.
3. Graneheim UH, Lundman B. Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: concepts, procedures and measures to achieve trustworthiness. Nurse education today 2004;24(2):105-112. PMID:14769454

4. Berman Y. Discussion groups on the Internet as sources of information: the case of social work. *Aslib Proceedings* 1996;**48**(2):31-36. DOI:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/eb051407>.
5. Bowers L. Constructing international professional identity: what psychiatric nurses talk about on the Internet. *International Journal of Nursing Studies* 1997;**34**(3):208-212. PMID: 9219053
6. Cervantez Thompson TL. You've got mail: Rehabilitation nurses on the RehabNurse-L LISTSERV. *Rehabilitation Nursing* 2002;**27**(4):146-151. PMID:12116527
7. Whitaker S, Cox AR, Alexander AM. Internet networking for pharmacists: an evaluation of a mailing list for UK pharmacists. *International Journal of Pharmacy Practice* 2003;**11**(1):25-32. DOI:10.1211/002235702784.
8. Smith C. A longitudinal study of the culture of MEDLIB-L. *Journal of Hospital Librarianship* 2004;**4**(1):29-42. PMID:14656258
9. Rodriguez-Recio F, Sendra-Portero F. Analysis of the Spanish-speaking mailing list RADIOLOGIA. *European Journal of Radiology* 2007;**63**:136-143. PMID: 17344009
10. Morken T, Bull N, Moen BE. The activity on a Norwegian Occupational Health mailing list 1997-2006. *Occupational Medicine* 2009;**59**:56-58. PMID:19001070
11. Foong DP, McGrouther DA. An Internet-based discussion forum as a useful resource for the discussion of clinical cases and an educational tool. *Indian journal of plastic surgery* 2010;**43**(2):195-10. PMID:PMC3010782
12. Abrahamson K, Fox R, Anderson JG. What nurses are talking about: content and community within a nursing online forum. *Stud Health Technol Inform* 2013;**183**:350-5. DOI:10.3233/978-1-61499-203-5-350.
13. Matta R, Doiron C, Leveridge MJ. The Dramatic Increase in Social Media in Urology. *The Journal of Urology* 2014;**192**(2):494-498. PMID:24576656
14. Murray PJ. Nurses' computer-mediated communications on NURSENET: a case study. *Computers in Nursing* 1996;**14**(4):227-234. PMID: 8718843
15. Long S, de Jonge D, Ziviani J, Jones A. Paediatricots: utilisation of an Australian list serve to support occupational therapists working with children. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal* 2009;**56**(1):63-71. PMID:20854490
16. Macdonald L, MacPherson DW, Gushulak BD. Online communication as a potential travel medicine research tool: analysis of messages posted on the TravelMed listserv. *Journal of Travel Medicine* 2009;**16**(1):7-12. PMID:19192121
17. Chaudhry A, Glodé LM, Gillman M, Miller RS. Trends in twitter use by physicians at the American Society of Clinical Oncology annual meeting, 2010 and 2011. *Journal of Oncology Practice* 2012;**8**(3):173-178. PMID: PMC3396806
18. Hajar Z, Clauson K, Jacobs RJ. Analysis of pharmacists' use of Twitter. *American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy* 2014;**71**(8):615-619 PMID:24688034
19. Canvasser NE, Ramo C, Morgan TM, Zheng K, Hollenbeck BK, Ghani KR. The use of social media in endourology: an analysis of the 2013 World Congress of Endourology meeting. *Journal of Endourology* 2015;**29**(5):615-620. PMID:25026076
20. Awad N, Cocchio C. Use of Twitter at a major national pharmacy conference. *American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy* 2015;**72**(1):65-69 PMID:25511841
21. Mishori R, Levy B, Donvan B. Twitter Use at a Family Medicine Conference: Analyzing# STFM13. *Family medicine* 2014;**46**(8):608-614 PMID:25163039
22. Reutzell TJ, Patel R. Medication management problems reported by subscribers to a school nurse listserv. *The Journal of School Nursing* 2001;**17**(3):131-139. PMID:11885443
23. Brooks F, Scott P. Knowledge work in nursing and midwifery: an evaluation through computer-mediated communication. *International Journal of Nursing Studies* 2006;**43**:83-97. PMID:16326164

24. Brooks F, Scott P. Exploring knowledge work and leadership in online midwifery communication. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 2006;**55**(4):510-20 PMID:16866846
25. Hara N, Hew K. Knowledge-sharing in an online community of health care professionals. *Information, Technology and People* 2007;**20**(3):235-261 DOI:10.1108/09593840710822859.
26. Hew KF, Hara N. Knowledge sharing in online environments: a qualitative case study. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 2007;**58**(14):2310-2324. DOI:10.1002/asi.20698.
27. Burg MA, Adorno G, Hidalgo J. An Analysis of Social Work Oncology Network Listserv Postings on the Commission of Cancer's Distress Screening Guidelines. *Journal of psychosocial oncology* 2012;**30**(6):636-651. PMID:23101548
28. Desai T, Shariff A, Shariff A, Kats M, Fang X, Christiano C, Ferris M. Tweeting the meeting: an in-depth analysis of Twitter activity at Kidney Week 2011. *PloS one* 2012;**7**(7):e40253. PMID:PMC3390326
29. McKendrick DRA, Cumming GP, Lee AJ. Increased use of Twitter at a medical conference: a report and a review of the educational opportunities. *Journal of Medical and Internet Research* 2012;**14**(6):e176. PMID:PMC3799570
30. Murty SA, Gilmore K, Richards KA, Altilio T. Using a LISTSERV a community of practice in end-of-life, hospice, and palliative care social work. *Journal of Social Work in End-of-Life & Palliative Care* 2012;**8**(1):77-101. PMID:22424385
31. Neill A, Cronin JJ, Brannigan D, O'Sullivan R, Cadogan M. The impact of social media on a major international emergency medicine conference. *Emergency Medicine Journal* 2014;**31**(5):401-4. PMID:23423992
32. Brynolf A, Johansson S, Appelgren E, Lynoe N, Edstedt Bonamy AK. Virtual colleagues, virtually colleagues--physicians' use of Twitter: a population-based observational study. *BMJ Open* 2013;**3**(7). PMID:PMC3731708
33. Kim C, Kang BS, Choi HJ, Lee YJ, Kang GH, Choi WJ, Kwon IH. Nationwide online social networking for cardiovascular care in Korea using Facebook. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2014;**21**(1):17-22. PMID:PMC3912716