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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1) In their qualitative report, the authors have several headings in the results section that discuss different aspects/opinions expressed on Twitter regarding care.data. However, there needs to be a more quantitative analysis for this paper to be informative to the scientific readers of this journal. For example, in the 3rd paragraph of the results, the authors state "There was considerable confusion about what care.data involves". What makes the authors state that? Was there one person who expressed this opinion? 75% of people? 50% of people? How do they define considerable? Please analyze these tweets more scientifically so we can better understand people's position. It is difficult to follow at present.

The authors also state in their results that "Tweets that were broadly supportive of care.data appeared to be far fewer in number than those that were critical". How fewer? This would be best represented graphically so we can easily see how people feel about this.

2) Again, in the results the authors seem to list various examples of tweets, but there is no quantitative analysis of how many people share these opinions. Anyone can go on twitter and look up the tweets themselves, there needs to be more of an analysis and justification as to why those tweets were chosen - which can be represented graphically on how these opinions are shared among others. By selecting a few tweets, the authors may be misrepresenting the overall sentiment on the topic and introducing bias.

3) The results section is far too long and needs to be summarized more succinctly - either through the use of tables or graphs. It is difficult to digest all the information presented.

4) The authors present a figure that is difficult to interpret and has no evidence for its current design. For instance, why is there no arrow from trust to legal issues? What gives it its current design and flow?
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