

TABLE 2.A. Data on communication aspects and potential conflict of interest (n=632).

		n (%)
Type of Dissemination	Facilitated information	35 (6)
	Facilitated information with potential conflict of interest	16 (3)
	Simple dissemination	235 (37)
	Simple dissemination with potential conflict of interest	76 (12)
	Self-promotion	270 (43)
Potential Conflict of Interest	Yes	362 (57)
	No	270 (43)

TABLE 2.B. Number of followers, likes, comments, and shares of the included posts.

	Followers*	Likes*	Comments*	Shares*
Instagram English (n=169)	11,201 (67,291) 506 [9-834,000]	176 (900) 17 [0-10,073]	4 (14) 1 [0-141]	n/a
Twitter English (n=170)	1,026 (2,278) 155 [0-14,582]	4 (14) 1 [0-133]	0 (1) 0 [0-6]	2 (10) 0 [0-80]
Instagram Portuguese (n=192)	5,564 (22,682) 1,059 [51-156,231]	131 (653) 17 [1-5,222]	2 (8) 0 [0-77]	n/a
Twitter Portuguese (n=101)	1,255 (3,002) 98 [0-12,800]	1 (2) 0 [0-15]	0 (0) 0 [0-2]	0 (1) 0 [0-8]
TOTAL (n=632)	5,162 (37,240) 485 [0-834,000]	88 (593) 7 [0-10,073]	2 (9) 0 [0-141]	1 (7) 0 [0-80]

*Data are presented as mean (SD) and median [min-max].

TABLE 2.C. Characteristics of the references used in the included posts (n=101).

	n	
Methodological Design	Systematic review	33
	Randomized controlled trial	14
	Narrative review	13
	Cohort study	12
	Cross-sectional study	10
	Guideline	4
	Case study	4
	Editorial	3
	Book	2
	Consensus	1
	Diagnostic study	1
	Animal model study	1
	Handout	1
	Clinical trial protocol	1
	Undergraduate thesis	1
Level of Evidence*	1a	20
	1b	8
	2a	13
	2b	18
	4	4
	5	3
	n/a	35
Evidence Quality Assessment[†]	Good	32
	Poor	39
	n/a	30
Information Consistency[§]	Accurate	53
	Inaccurate	2
	Partial	47
	Not possible	3
Selection Bias[§]	Yes	6
	No	96
	Not possible	3

*Level of evidence assessed using the Oxford Centre for Evidence-based Medicine scale

[†]Evidence quality assessed using specific tool according to the methodological design used; Randomized clinical trials assessed by *Physiotherapy Evidence Database* (PEDro) Scale (good quality ≥ 6 points, low quality ≤ 5 points); Systematic reviews were assessed by *A Critical Appraisal Tool for Systematic Reviews* (AMSTAR II) (good quality = none, one or more non-critical weakness, low quality = one or more critical flaws); Observational studies were assessed via *Epidemiological Appraisal Instrument* (EIA) (good quality > 1 point; low quality ≤ 1 point); and Clinical guidelines were assessed via *Advancing Guideline Development, Reporting and Evaluation* (AGREE II) (good quality $\geq 50\%$ at domain 3, low quality $< 50\%$ on Domain 3). Other designs were not assessed considering the low relevance for intervention evidence.

[§]n=105 because four references were cited in two different posts.

TABLE 2.D. Post hoc analysis aiming to verify whether posts using scientific references reach more people or engage more followers compared to posts without references.

	Posts with references*	Posts without references*	Median difference (95% CI)
Followers	1,946 (3,904) 421 [0-25,906]	5,689 (40,157) 494 [0-834,000]	-73 (-297 to 302)
Likes	15 (34) 2 [0-257]	100 (639) 8 [0-10,073]	-6 (-8 to -2)

*Data are presented as mean (SD) and median [min-max].

TABLE 2.E. Post hoc analysis aiming to verify whether posts of profiles with conflict of interest reach more people or engage more followers compared to posts of profiles without conflict.

	With conflict of interest*	Without conflict of interest*	Median difference (95% CI)
Followers	7,176 (48,517) 576 [0-834,000]	2,462 (9,300) 375 [0-103,008]	201 (-2 to 356)
Likes	105 (570) 7 [0-5,222]	65 (624) 7 [0-10,073]	0 (-4 to 3)

*Data are presented as mean (SD) and median [min-max].

TABLE 2.F. Post hoc analysis aiming to verify whether the non-use of scientific reference is related to profiles with conflict of interest.

		Presence of conflict of interest		
		Yes	No	total
Use of references	No	338	205	543
	Yes	24	65	89
total		362	270	632

Chi-square $p < 0.001$, $\Phi = 0.248$

TABLE 2.G. Post hoc analysis aiming to verify whether facilitation of knowledge disseminations is related to scientific references of good quality.

		Methodological quality		
		Good	Poor	total
Facilitated the dissemination	Yes	23	17	40
	No	7	18	25
total		30	35	65

Chi-square $p = 0.02$, $\Phi = 0.288$