

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

**A social way to experience a scientific event: Twitter use at the 7th European Public Health Conference**

**This is the author's manuscript**

*Original Citation:*

*Availability:*

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1570954> since 2016-06-23T09:56:03Z

*Published version:*

DOI:10.1177/1403494815612932

*Terms of use:*

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)



**A social way to experience a scientific event: Twitter use at the 7th European Public Health Conference**

Journal:	<i>Scandinavian Journal of Public Health</i>
Manuscript ID:	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Bert, Fabrizio; University of Torino, Department of Public Health Sciences Zeegers Paget, Dineke; EUPHA Office, Scaioli, Giacomo; University of Torino, Department of Public Health Sciences
Problem Areas and Research:	Other
Discipline:	Prevention and Health Promotion
Methodology:	Quantitative – Qualitative combined

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

**Title**

A social way to experience a scientific event: Twitter use at the 7<sup>th</sup> European Public Health Conference

**Authors**

Fabrizio Bert<sup>1,2</sup>, Dineke Zeegers Paget<sup>1</sup>, Giacomo Scaioli<sup>1,2§</sup>

**Affiliation**

<sup>1</sup> EUPHA Office, PO Box 1568, 3500 BN Utrecht, The Netherlands

<sup>2</sup> Department of Public Health Sciences, University of Torino, via Santena 5 bis, 10126 Torino, Italy

**Corresponding Author**

§ Giacomo Scaioli

Department of Public Health, University of Turin

via Santena 5 bis, 10126 Turin, Italy

Tel: +390116705837, Fax: +390116705889

e-mail: giacomo.scaioli@unito.it

**Word count:** 2589

## Abstract

### Aims

Many studies analysed Twitter's use by attendees of scientific meetings and the characteristics of conference-related messages and most active attendees. Despite these previous reports, to date no studies have described the use of Twitter during Public Health conferences. For this reason, we decided to perform an analysis of Twitter's use during the 7th European Public Health (EPH) Conference (Glasgow 19-22 November 2014).

### Methods

All the tweets published from 21 July to 2 December 2014 and including the hashtag #ephglasgow were retrieved and several information (author, date, retweets, favourites, mentions, presence of pictures and/or external links, content type and topics) were analysed using Stata MP11.

### Results

A total of 1067 tweets with the hashtag #ephglasgow were retrieved, 86.3% of these were tweeted during the conference. A total of 209 single accounts tweeted, pictures were present in 29.7% tweets while external links were published in 13.8%. Conference speakers were mentioned in around 30% of tweets. Almost the 60% of the tweets had a session-related content. Considering only the session-related tweets, one third had as main topic "Health inequalities and migrant and ethnic minority health", while 20% were "Health policy and health economics" oriented.

### Conclusions

Twitter's use during conferences is a growing phenomenon that allows public health professionals to be informed on all aspects of conference. Meeting's organisers have to promote online discussion and conference-related knowledge dissemination. Further studies are needed to highlight potential and issues of this communication tool, especially in the multidisciplinary public health field.

**Keywords:** Social media; Twitter; Public Health; Conference.

## Introduction

The use of social media, defined as “websites and applications that enable users to create and share content or to participate in social networking” [1], is increasing year after year [2,3]. Twitter, a platform that allow users to write short messages (up to 140 characters) is one of the most popular social media, with 284 million monthly active users and 500 million tweets sent per day [4]. In recent years, Twitter has become a useful tool for medical and scientific purposes [5-8]. A particular application of Twitter is its use during scientific conferences. The potential of Twitter in increasing networking skills, attendees connectivity, participation in debates and knowledge sharing is largely recognized [9,10].

Twitter enables the creation of an hashtag, that is a keyword (or unspaced phrase) preceded by the symbol “#”, by which it is possible to identify all the tweets related to a specific topic [11]. Many conference organizers have started creating an official hashtag in order to identify all the tweets related to the specific conference [12-14].

Several studies have analysed the use of Twitter by attendees of scientific meetings, assessing the total use of this platform, the characteristics of the conference-related messages, and the most “productive” attendees [12-22]. For example, Radmanesh and Kotsenas analysed Twitter use during the 2014 annual meeting of the American Society of Neuroradiology, showing the average numbers of tweets per day and the total number of users stratified for professional category [13]. In another study Mishori et al. analysed public tweets coming from the 2013 STFM (Family Medicine) Annual Spring Conference to see who was talking about the conference and in what ways [12]. Wilkinson et al., instead, observed the trends variation in the use of Twitter at eight urology conferences that took place in 2013 [14]. Despite these previous reports, to date no studies have described the use of Twitter during Public Health conferences.

For this reason, we decided to perform an analysis of the use of Twitter during the 7<sup>th</sup> European Public Health (EPH) Conference that was attended by more than 1500 attendees and took place in Glasgow, Scotland (UK) from 19 to 22 November 2014 [23]. The EPH Conference is an annual scientific meeting addressed to all public health and health services professionals and students worldwide. The conference is initiated by the European Public Health Association (EUPHA), and organised in collaboration with other partners [24]. In July 2014, the official hashtag #ephglasgow was created and tweeted for the first time by

1  
2  
3 the conference organisers, and during the conference all the attendees were invited to include this hashtag in  
4 their tweets.  
5

6  
7 The aim of the present paper is to describe quantitatively and qualitatively all the tweets that included the  
8 official hashtag of the EPH Conference, to evaluate how much this social media was used during this  
9 meeting and which were the most active users.  
10  
11

## 12 13 14 **Methods**

15  
16  
17 All the tweets that included the hashtag #ephglasgow were retrieved from the website www.twitter.com, by  
18 using the tool “search on Twitter” [25]. Tweets published from 21 July 2014 (day in which the hashtag  
19 #ephglasgow appeared for the first time) to 2 December 2014 (ten days after the end of the conference) were  
20 included in our study. For each tweet, information about the author, the day in which the tweet was sent, the  
21 presence of pictures and/or external links, how many times the tweets from any account was amplified or  
22 emphasized by retweeting or favouring, the mention of any other twitter account (by using the symbol @)  
23 and the language of the tweet (English/other languages) were retrieved by two independent researchers. The  
24 same two researchers manually analysed the text of each tweet published, retrieving information about any  
25 mention of conference speakers in the text. Speakers were defined as all the people that were talking to an  
26 audience during pre conferences, plenary sessions, workshops, oral, pitch and poster presentations.  
27

28  
29 Furthermore, all the tweets were categorised as follows, on the basis of previous studies on this topic  
30 [13,15,21]:  
31

- 32 1) Session-related: content related to a conference session (impressions, quotes, other). E.g. “Margaret  
33 Whitehead recommending the EU funded #demetriq at #ephglasgow showing introduction of UK minimum  
34 wage improved #mentalhealth”;
  - 35 2) Social: not related to the content of the sessions, (jokes, humour, social relations). E.g. “Did you meet Sir  
36 Roger the Elephant at Kelvingrove museum last night? #ephglasgow #ephglasgowquiz @EPHconference”;
  - 37 3) Logistic: information given to attendees about sessions or organizational aspects. E.g. “Meet & Greet  
38 #ephglasgow w/ Presidents Sections Environment, Health Promotion, Practice & Policy, Chronic Diseases at  
39 @EUPHActs stand, 12:15”;
- 40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 4) Advertising: commercial tweets, promotion of products. E.g. “Visit our exhibition stand @EPHconference  
4 for free access & to find out more about our books & journals #ephglasgow”;

5  
6  
7 5) Scientific promotion: promotion of papers and scientific works. E.g. “Very interesting @PLOSONE  
8 @rickwahs paper presented #ephglasgow on decommodification & health ineq by welfare regime  
9 http://www.plosone.org/article/info...”;

10  
11  
12 6) Other: tweets not related to the other five categories.

13  
14  
15 The “session-related” tweets were further categorised in six different topics:

16  
17 1) Health promotion (including advocacy and health literacy);

18  
19 2) Health policy and health economics (including tweets related to the economic crisis);

20  
21 3) Health inequalities (including migrant and ethnic minority health);

22  
23 4) Public health training, education and research;

24  
25 5) Communicable/non-communicable diseases;

26  
27 6) Other (all the tweets not strictly related to the previously mentioned five topics).

28  
29 All the re-tweets were excluded from our analysis in order to avoid misclassification of topics.

30  
31 Analysis were performed using STATA V.11 (Stata Corp, College Station, Texas, USA, 2011) showing  
32 percentages for dichotomic and categorical variables, and mean and standard deviations for continuous  
33 variables.  
34  
35  
36

## 37 38 **Results**

### 39 40 *Tweets statistics*

41  
42 A total of 1067 tweets with the hashtag #ephglasgow were retrieved. Table 1 describes the main  
43 characteristics of the tweets collected. The most part were tweeted during the four days of the conference  
44 (921 - 86.3%), while 102 (9.6%) were published before the conference (21 July – 18 November 2014) and 44  
45 (4.1%) in the ten days after. A total of 209 single accounts tweeted using the hashtag #ephglasgow, for an  
46 average of 5.6 tweets per account. Considering only the 921 messages tweeted during the conference, the  
47 highest number of these (288 – 31.3%) were sent on Friday 21 November 2014, and the lowest number (155  
48 – 16.8%) on Wednesday 19 November, the day in which only pre-conferences were organised.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The overwhelming majority of the tweets retrieved were in English, while only eight were written in other  
4 languages. Pictures were present in around one third of the tweets (29.7%) while external links were  
5 published in 13.8%. It must be noted that almost 90% of the “scientific promotional” tweets included an  
6 external link, compared with the 4% of the “conference-related tweets”. (Data not shown).  
7  
8

9  
10  
11 Around half of the messages mentioned at least a twitter account (by using the symbol @). Conference  
12 speakers were mentioned in around one-third of the tweets. Among these, if we consider only the  
13 conference-related tweets, nearly 50% mentioned a speaker.  
14  
15

### 16 17 18 19 *Tweets’ “popularity”*

20  
21 The popularity of each tweet was assessed through the number of re-tweets and “favourites” (Table 1). The  
22 mean of the re-tweets was  $1.55 \pm 0.18$  (range 0-52) while the mean of “favourites” was  $0.79 \pm 0.08$  (range 0-  
23 13). The tweet with the highest number of re-tweets was written by the actual president of the European  
24 Public Health Association, Prof. Martin McKee, while the one with more “favourites” described a sarcastic  
25 flow chart for asking questions at a conference (Data not shown).  
26  
27

28  
29 The most active account, with a total of 72 tweets, was the one of Vesna Bjegovic, president of the  
30 Association of Schools of Public Health in the European Region (ASPHER), followed by the official account  
31 of the EPH Conference with 40 tweets (Figure 1). The most mentioned account was, as expected,  
32 @EPHConference (165 times) while the second one was @ASPHERoffice, official account of ASPHER  
33 (Figure 1).  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

### 43 44 *Qualitative analysis of the tweets*

45  
46 Table 2 shows number and percentages of tweets for each category. Almost 60% of the tweets had a session-  
47 related content (quotes, impressions, comments related to something that was discussed during a specific  
48 session of the conference). Social and logistic categories accounted for around 16% of the total tweets each,  
49 while promotional tweets (scientific and non scientific) represented a total of 8% of posts published. In Table  
50 3, statistics about contents and topics of tweets are reported. Looking at the session-related tweets only, one  
51 third had as main topic “Health inequalities and migrant and ethnic minority health”, while 20% were  
52 “Health policy and health economics” oriented and 18% about Public Health education, training and  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 research. A relatively small number of tweets were published regarding “Communicable and non-  
4 communicable diseases” (5.4%).  
5  
6

## 7 **Discussion**

8  
9  
10 This paper aimed to describe quantitatively and qualitatively all the tweets that included the official hashtag  
11 of the last European Public Health (EPH) Conference in order to evaluate how much Twitter was used during  
12 this meeting and who were the most active users. The 7<sup>th</sup> EPH Conference in Glasgow was attended by over  
13 1500 delegates from 65 countries. The programme consisted of 7 plenary sessions, 16 pre conferences, 47  
14 workshops, 27 oral sessions, 27 pitch sessions and 18 poster walks.  
15  
16  
17

18  
19 To our knowledge, the present work is the first study analysing statistics and contents of tweets published  
20 during a Public Health Conference. Of the 1500 public health professionals and students attended the 7<sup>th</sup>  
21 EPH Conference in Glasgow, only 14% (209 attendees) were us Twitter Contributors (TC) that used  
22 #ephglasgow hashtag. In another study the proportion of attendees among TC was similarly high, as  
23 reported by Awad and Cocchio in a paper about the use of Twitter at a major national pharmacy conference  
24 (90.3% of TC) [15]. A relatively high percentage of tweets (~10%) was published before the conference, in  
25 many cases to promote specific sessions of the scientific event or to provide logistic information for  
26 attendees. Only 25% (25/102) of the tweets posted before the conference was published by the official  
27 organizers’ accounts, demonstrating a successful and satisfying involvement of attendees.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39  
40 A third of the tweets included an event-related picture. In many cases the subject of the pictures was  
41 represented by slides of ppt presentation of conference speakers, published with the aim of increasing the  
42 dissemination of scientific messages and enriching the content of tweets with scientific data and graphs.  
43 Interestingly, 14% of the tweets analysed included an external link. In particular, almost 90% of the  
44 “scientific promotional” tweets included an external link, compared with 4% of the “conference-related  
45 tweets”. This difference is easily explainable considering the potential willingness of attendees to promote  
46 their work and publications, taking advantage of the official hashtag of the conference. Through this tool,  
47 attendees tried to increase the impact of their studies among scientific community.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The large number of mentions, re-tweets and favourites highlights the function of Twitter as a tool of  
4 networking and social connector for scientific professionals. This feature is even more important if we  
5 consider the multi-disciplinary and intersectoral structure of the public health field.  
6  
7

8  
9 Obviously the most part of the tweets were conference-related. This suggests that Twitter could be helpful to  
10 increase the level of debate during a conference. This suggestion was previously proposed by other authors,  
11 such as Ronald et al. who supposed that “Twitter could improve presentation quality, particularly if speakers  
12 were informed of the capabilities of social media and the need of clarity of key messages” or McKendrick et  
13 al. who claimed that Twitter use can further reinforce the “real” learning points from each talk or  
14 session[20,22,26]. Since Twitter use seems to be related to a positive impact on conference quality, the use  
15 of this kind of tool should be encouraged by conference organisers. The European Public Health Association  
16 tried to facilitate and promote the use of Twitter and to increase the number of tweets by implementing the  
17 Twitter Wall. During plenary sessions, indeed, on the big screen behind the speakers a Twitter timeline  
18 containing the hashtag #ephglasgow was projected and the moderator asked the audience to use Twitter for  
19 questions directed to speakers. Two “Twitter Wall moderators” made a “live” selection of all the tweets  
20 related to the topic of the session and deleted inopportune and off-topic tweets. The role of the Twitter Wall  
21 during the conferences deserves to be further examined in future studies.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 The “topic” most tweeted was the following one: “Health inequalities and migrant and ethnic minority  
36 health”. The preference for this theme can be easily related to the title of the Conference “Mind the gap:  
37 Reducing inequalities in health and health care” that oriented the choice of key-note speakers during plenary  
38 sessions, and the contact in roundtables and workshops [27].  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 The biggest contributors in terms of tweets published were the official account of EPH Conference and the  
44 president of ASPHER. The relevance given by these associations to social media is in line with what is  
45 proposed and implemented by other scientific societies, such as the American Academic of Orthopaedic  
46 Surgeons (AAOS) or the Society of Teachers of Family Medicine (STFM) [12-18]. The involvement of  
47 attendees in debates and discussion is part of the new strategy of EUPHA which aims to facilitate and  
48 activate a strong voice of the public health network by enhancing visibility of the evidence and by  
49 strengthening the capacity of public health professionals. Three main objectives of this “EUPHA Strategy  
50 2014-2020”, indeed, are: 1. To be a leading scientific and independent voice in the field of public health and  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 health services research and policy; 2. To build capacity and knowledge in the field of public health and  
4 health services research with the aim of supporting evidence-informed practice and policy decisions; and 3.  
5  
6 To prepare future generations of engaged and connected public health professionals for their leadership role  
7  
8 in public health. The use of social media is a recognized tool to achieve these aims [28,29].  
9

10  
11 We are aware that this study has some limitations that deserve discussion. First of all, we analysed only the  
12 tweets including the hashtag “ephglasgow”. This could be reductive and could underestimate the real amount  
13 of online discussions about the EPH conference, especially if no hashtag or no official hashtags were used.  
14  
15 However, the official hashtag was repeatedly suggested before and during the conference (e.g. on the  
16 programme booklet) in order to convey the information flow.  
17

18  
19  
20 Secondly, we decided to stop the tweets collection ten days after the end of the conference and messages  
21 tweeted after this date were not included in our search. Nevertheless, the number of tweets using the hashtag  
22 #ephglasgow drastically decreased just after the conference since the hashtag for the upcoming EPH  
23 conference was already launched (#ephmilan). Finally, we only checked the tweets related to the 7<sup>th</sup> EPH  
24 Conference and therefore we limit our consideration to this specific scientific event. Further studies are  
25 needed to evaluate time trends and to analyse how this social media will change the way the delegates  
26 perceive the participation in scientific conferences.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

### 36 **Conclusions**

37  
38  
39 Social media use, and especially Twitter, during scientific events is a growing phenomenon that allows  
40 public health professionals to propose questions to the presenters, to debate about topics of interest, to  
41 provide insights about sessions for those who have not attended the conference. In present time, it is  
42 mandatory for conference organisers to keep attention and to promote online discussion and knowledge  
43 dissemination during conferences. Further studies are needed to highlight the potential and issues of this  
44 communication tool and to supply information that can help organisations and societies to build a strategy  
45 for social media utilisation. This is particularly important in the public health field where the wide audience  
46 of interested people is well suited to the system of dissemination of key-points typical of microblogging tools  
47 as Twitter.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Conflicts of interest**

Fabrizio Bert and Giacomo Scaioli are EUPHANxt coordinators.

Dineke Zeegers Paget is the executive director of EUPHA and director of the EPH Conference Office.

For Peer Review Only

## References

1. Oxford Dictionaries: <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/social-media> Accessed 5 February 2015.
2. Olenski S. Social Media Usage Up 800% For U.S. Online Adults In Just 8 Years. Forbes 2013: <http://www.forbes.com/sites/steveolenski/2013/09/06/social-media-usage-up-800-for-us-online-adults-in-just-8-years/> Accessed 5 February 2015.
3. Bert F, Giacometti M, Gualano MR, Siliquini R. Smartphones and health promotion: a review of the evidence. *J Med Syst* 2014;38(1):9995.
4. Twitter. About: <https://about.twitter.com/company> Accessed 5 February 2015.
5. Rocheleau M, Sadasivam RS, Baquis K, et al. An observational study of social and emotional support in smoking cessation twitter accounts: content analysis of tweets. *J Med Internet Res* 2015;17(1):e18.
6. Reavley NJ, Pilkington PD. Use of Twitter to monitor attitudes toward depression and schizophrenia: an exploratory study. *PeerJ* 2014;2:e647.
7. Forgie SE, Duff JP, Ross S. Twelve tips for using Twitter as a learning tool in medical education. *Med Teach* 2013;53(1):8–14.
8. Lee JL, DeCamp M, Dredze M, Chisolm MS, Berger ZD. What are health-related users tweeting? A qualitative content analysis of health-related users and their messages on twitter. *J Med Internet Res* 2014;16(10):e237.
9. Mckay M, Sanko JS, Shekhter I, Birnbach DJ. Twitter as a tool to enhance student engagement during an interprofessional patient safety course. *J Interprof Care* 2014;28(6):565-7.
10. Bik HM, Goldstein MC. An introduction to social media for scientists. *PLoS Biol* 2013;11(4):e1001535.
11. Twitter. Using hashtags on Twitter: <https://support.twitter.com/articles/49309-using-hashtags-on-twitter#>. Accessed 10 February 2015.
12. Mishori R, Levy B, Donvan B. Twitter use at a family medicine conference: analyzing #STFM13. *Fam Med* 2014;46(8):608-14.

- 1  
2  
3 13. Radmanesh A, Kotsenas AL. Social Media and Scientific Meetings: An Analysis of Twitter Use at  
4 the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Neuroradiology. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2014.  
5 [Epub ahead of print]  
6  
7
- 8  
9 14. Wilkinson SE, Basto MY, Perovic G, Lawrentschuk N, Murphy DG. The social media revolution is  
10 changing the conference experience: analytics and trends from eight international meetings. *BJU Int*  
11 2014. doi: 10.1111/bju.12910. [Epub ahead of print]  
12  
13
- 14  
15 15. Awad N, Cocchio C. Use of Twitter at a major national pharmacy conference. *Am J Health Syst*  
16 *Pharm* 2015 ;72(1):65-9.  
17  
18
- 19 16. Cochran A, Kao LS, Gusani NJ, Suliburk JW, Nwomeh BC. Use of Twitter to document the 2013  
20 Academic Surgical Congress. *J Surg Res* 2014;190(1):36-40.  
21  
22
- 23 17. Ferguson C, Inglis SC, Newton PJ, Cripps PJ, MacDonald PS, Davidson PM. Social media: a tool to  
24 spread information: a case study analysis of twitter conversation at the Cardiac Society of Australia  
25 & New Zealand 61st annual scientific meeting 2013. *Collegian* 2014;21(2):89-93.  
26  
27
- 28 18. Gornés D, Rodríguez-Roiz JM, Fernández-Valencia JA. Social media in orthopaedics: a case study  
29 analysis of twitter posts at the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons (AAOS) Congress 2012  
30 and the European Federation of National Associations of Orthopedics and Traumatology (EFORT)  
31 Congress 2012. *IJAJR* 2014;1:17-19.  
32  
33
- 34 19. Loeb S, Bayne CE, Frey C, et al. Use of social media in urology: data from the American Urological  
35 Association (AUA). *BJU Int* 2014;113(6):993-8.  
36  
37
- 38 20. McKendrick DR, Cumming GP, Lee AJ. Increased use of Twitter at a medical conference: a report  
39 and a review of the educational opportunities. *J Med Internet Res* 2012;14(6):e176.  
40  
41
- 42 21. Neill A, Cronin JJ, Brannigan D, O'Sullivan R, Cadogan M. The impact of social media on a major  
43 international emergency medicine conference. *Emerg Med J* 2014;31(5):401-4.  
44  
45
- 46 22. Roland D, May N, Body R, Carley S, Lyttle MD. Are you a SCEPTIC? SoCial mEdia Precision &  
47 uTility In Conferences. *Emerg Med J* 2014. pii: emermed-2014-204216. [Epub ahead of print]  
48  
49
- 50 23. European Public Health (EPH) Conference - Glasgow 2014: [http://ephconference.org/conference-](http://ephconference.org/conference-glasgow-2014-149)  
51 [glasgow-2014-149](http://ephconference.org/conference-glasgow-2014-149) Accessed 10 February 2015.  
52  
53
- 54 24. European Public Health Association (EUPHA): <http://www.eupha.org/> Accessed 12 February 2015.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 25. Twitter: [www.twitter.com](http://www.twitter.com) Accessed 10 February 2015.  
4  
5 26. McKendrick DR. Smartphones, Twitter and new learning opportunities at anaesthetic conferences.  
6  
7 *Anaesthesia* 2012;67(4):438-439.  
8  
9 27. European Public Health (EPH) Conference: <http://www.ephconference.eu/> Accessed 12 February  
10  
11 2015.  
12  
13 28. Zeegers Paget D, Barnhoom F, Masic I. EUPHA STRATEGY 2014-2020. *Mater Sociomed* 2014;  
14  
15 26(6):422-426.  
16  
17 29. Bert F, van der Star A, Scaioli G. Next generation of public health professionals: networks and the  
18  
19 EUPHAnxtintegration approach. *Eur J Public Health* 2014;24(6):876.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table 1. Quantitative analysis of the tweets that used the hashtag #ephglasgow (N=1067)**

		N	%
Date	Before the conference	102	9.6
	During the conference	921	86.3
	After the conference	44	4.1
Pictures	Yes	317	29.7
	No	749	70.3
Links	Yes	147	13.8
	No	919	86.2
Language	English	1058	99.2
	other	8	0.8
Mentions (@)	Yes (one or more)	561	52.6
	no	505	47.4
Retweets		1.55 <sup>a</sup>	±0.18 <sup>b</sup>
Favourites		0.79 <sup>a</sup>	±0.08 <sup>b</sup>
Speaker mention	Yes	354	33.2
	No	712	66.8

<sup>a</sup> Mean<sup>b</sup> Standard Deviation



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table 2. Number and percentages of tweets for each category (N=1067)**

<b>Tweet category</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Conference-related	628	58.9
Social	175	16.4
Logistic	168	15.8
Promotion	37	3.5
Scientific promotion	46	4.3
other	12	1.1

For Peer Review Only

**Table 3. Number and percentages of conference-related tweets for each main topic (N=628).**

Topic	N	%
Health promotion, advocacy, health literacy	82	13.0
Health policy and health economics	130	20.7
Health inequalities and migrant and ethnic minority health	192	30.6
Public Health education, training and research	111	17.7
Communicable and non-communicable diseases	34	5.4
Other	79	12.6

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Figure 1. Most prolific and most mentioned accounts.  
113x200mm (96 x 96 DPI)