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Background: Traditional system for assessing the quality and impact of a scientific journal is based on the number of citations. One of the main forms of measurement is the impact factor, which measures the impact that a journal has on the scientific community. Despite its traditional use, this quality and impact assessment system has been criticized in recent years. The “Alternative Assessment Metrics” initiative (Altmetrics) seeks to define new measures of metrics for scientific publications. Alternative metrics are based on the number of “mentions” of an article in various online sources, including blogs and social networking platforms. The alternative metrics are more dynamic and accumulate quickly in real time. The social networks most frequently used by scientific journals are Facebook, YouTube and Twitter.

Objectives: To evaluate presence, number of followers and activity of rheumatology journals in 3 social networks (Facebook, Twitter and Youtube).

Methods: Platform of scientific journals SCOPUS was consulted, selecting journals classified as rheumatology journals. Scimago Journal Rank (SRJ) of 2017 was taken to evaluate the quality of the journal. The social networks Facebook, Twitter and YouTube were consulted, searching for rheumatology journals of those found in SCOPUS with active accounts in these social networks. Date of consultation: 13-11-18

Results: 61 rheumatology journals in SCOPUS, of which only 8 (13.1%) had an active account in at least one of the social networks consulted. On Facebook the most active and most popular magazine was Nature Reviews, followed by the Journal of Rheumatology and Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases. It should be noted that Nature Reviews includes other journals in their social networks that cover other specialties of medicine such as cardiology, immunology, microbiology, oncology, among others. On Twitter, as on Facebook, magazine with largest number of followers was Nature Reviews, followed by Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases and Journal of Rheumatology. Activity on Twitter, measured as number of tweets, had same behavior according to the number of followers. The only journal with channel on YouTube was Annals of the Rheumatic disease with 67 subscribers, 12 videos, of which the most watched has 315 reproductions. See table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>SJR</th>
<th>Facebook</th>
<th>Twitter</th>
<th>Twits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases</td>
<td>5.505</td>
<td>3.032</td>
<td>4.042</td>
<td>2.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Reviews (Rheumatology)</td>
<td>2.951</td>
<td>426.513</td>
<td>7.146</td>
<td>3.976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osteoarthritis and Cartilage (Q1)</td>
<td>2.290</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthritis Research and Therapy (Q1)</td>
<td>2.080</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2.756</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Rheumatology (Q1)</td>
<td>1.687</td>
<td>4012</td>
<td>3.341</td>
<td>943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Rheumatology Journal (Q2)</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Clinical Rheumatology (Q2)</td>
<td>0.562</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acta Reumatologica Portuguesa (Q2)</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Characterization of scientific journals in social networks in rheumatology. SJR; Scimago Journal Rank. Facebook: Number of followers. Twitter: Number of followers. Twits: Number of tweets reported on the platform

Conclusion: YT and FB are social networks with a high content of false information. The majority of available videos promise to cure different rheumatic diseases (even several simultaneously). This is the first work of a line of research that seeks to highlight the high degree of misinformation. We will continue to analyze other diseases and social networks, to make publications and communications in different media and to alert local regulatory entities.
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ONLINE EDUCATION IMPROVES PHYSICIANS’ KNOWLEDGE OF FAMILY PLANNING AND PREGNANCY MANAGEMENT IN WOMEN WITH CHRONIC INFLAMMATORY RHUMEATIC DISEASES
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Background: Chronic inflammatory rheumatic disease (CIRDs) often develop in women during their childbearing years. Preconception counseling and coordinated medical and obstetric care are essential to maintain control of the disease and maximize the chances of a successful pregnancy.

Objectives: This study assessed whether online CME can improve physicians’ understanding of the risks of uncontrolled chronic rheumatic diseases in pregnancy and the benefits of proactive pregnancy planning, and enhance physician confidence in managing such patients.

Methods: Physicians participated in an online CME activity consisting of a 15-minute video discussion between 2 experts with accompanying slides. Educational effect was assessed using a 4-question repeated pairs, pre-post-assessment. A Chi-square Test of Independence was used to determine if a statistically significant improvement (5% significance level, P <.05) existed in the number of correct responses between the pretest and posttest scores. Cramer’s V was used to estimate the effect of the education. The CME accredited activity launched on August 2 2018, and data were collected through August 30 2018.

Results:
• Rheumatologists (n=47) had a high baseline knowledge of family planning and pregnancy management in women with CIRDs, but the activity had a significant impact (P = .0008) on rheumatologists’ knowledge and the Cramer’s V value of 0.199 indicates a considerable effect of the education
• The average percentage of correct responses for rheumatologists was 91% post-activity compared with 76% pre-activity
• 64% more rheumatologists answered all 3 questions correctly post-activity compared with pre-activity (74% vs. 45%)
• 26% of rheumatologists gained confidence in their ability to manage CIRDs in pregnant patients, with an average confidence shift of 9% of rheumatologists (n=40) also had a fairly high baseline knowledge of family planning and pregnancy management in women with CIRDs, but again, the activity had a significant impact (P = .0005) on their knowledge and the Cramer’s V value of 0.226 indicates a considerable effect of the education
• The average percentage of correct responses for obstetricians/gynaecologists was 83% post-activity compared with 63% pre-activity
• 97% more obstetricians/gynaecologists answered all 3 questions correctly post-activity compared with pre-activity (65% vs. 33%)
• Almost half (45%) of obstetricians/gynaecologists gained substantial confidence in their ability to manage CIRDs in pregnant patients, with an average confidence shift of 22%

Conclusion: This online, 15-minute video discussion between 2 experts significantly improved rheumatologists’ and obstetricians/gynaecologists’ understanding of family planning and pregnancy management in women with CIRDs which may lead to improved outcomes for both women and babies. Both groups would benefit from further education to reinforce knowledge of disease activity on conception and pregnancy and to emphasize the need for collaborative proactive family planning in women with CIRDs.
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