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Reviewer's report:

The authors have developed a method called peer2ref to support authors and editors in selecting suitable reviewers, which is a critical step in the process of publishing research in referred scientific journals. The paper is well written, interesting and easy to read.

Major Compulsory Revisions

- However, in spite of the extensive simulations from the benchmark, there is a complete lack of statistical information related to the comparison between disambiguated profiles and not-disambiguated profiles.
- In addition, even though the authors provided the results of the performance evaluation between the disambiguated profiles and not-disambiguated profiles in the results section, it is mandatory that the authors need to show the comparison of previous works such as eTBlast and Jane, which are the web server applications to find similar abstracts in MEDLINE. It is not clear for me whether the proposed method, which relies on comparison of a word profile of the manuscript, has better strengths than the previous works, which relies on comparison of other single manuscripts. It will be nice if the authors could comment on the strengths and drawbacks of their method.

Minor Essential Revisions

- To address the problem of author name ambiguity, the proposed method uses a pre-computed dataset of disambiguated authors deduced automatically from all references in MEDLINE. As the number of researchers, journals and publications increases, there is the need to re-compute the dataset of disambiguated authors and following keywords from MEDLINE records. It will be nice if the authors could comment the update issue of pre-computed dataset of disambiguated authors for users.
- There is lack of descriptions for the figure 2. Although user could check the step by step example from the web site, the authors should provide details for the snapshot of the results obtained by peer2ref.
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