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Reviewer's report:

This article reports on a retrospective analysis of Twitter posts during or adjacent to the 2016 Dissemination and Implementation Science Conference in health, using posts that used the official conference hashtag (#DIScience16). The study team first developed a coding strategy for the tweets, and then used established network analysis techniques for analyzing social media data, and reported descriptive statistics on the tweets (theme, location of origin of the operator, etc). The study topic is novel for the field, and the analytic procedures used in the study appear sound. The major weaknesses of the study include potential omission of relevant tweets due to the limited search terms employed, and the single point cross-sectional design (on a related point, that the data are from the 2016 D&I conference - as we're looking forward to the 2018 conference). Overall, this study will be of moderate interest to the field, with heightened interest for conference organizers promoting use of social media as part of conference dissemination and communication strategies.

Below are further comments for the authors.

Abstract. Well aligns with the methods and results described in the paper. No change recommended.

Background. Adequately describes the background to the research. No change recommended.

Methods. The scientific methods - including data acquisition, manipulation and analysis procedures - are well described and appropriate. The authors note the study limitations in the discussion that align with my concern, and I recommend that the authors address these concerns in a revised manuscript.

1) Include data from 2017. More than one cross-section of data would greatly strengthen the piece, to look at changes in tweeting patterns over time.

2) Broaden the search criteria. A quick search on Twitter from the 2017 conference demonstrates that a large number of users do not use the official conference handle, and by
broadening the search terms, the study would capture tweets that were not included in the initial analysis.

Results. The results are appropriately presented for a cross-sectional, descriptive study. They do, however, demonstrate that a relatively small number of organizations heavily influence the results. It would be of interest to know if this is the same scenario in 2017 - and how the influencers are evolving over time.

Discussion. Address the key points. No change recommended.
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