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Reviewer's report:

I don't think the case has been made for incorporating social media data into the EMR. You justify PROs well, and the Sweden example demonstrates well why longitudinal monitoring is of value. My problem is that you use the use of social media analytics in health research to justify using social media data CLINICALLY, which is a different world. Your section on the use of social media for research in health is great, but it has no direct, patient-level clinical examples, so doesn't support your argument for incorporating social-media monitoring into the EMR. You mention the risk of bias (though you fail to use the actual word 'bias'), but only in one section and not related to clinical care. The risk of missed data is problematic in research, but is a much larger peril in clinical care, and needs to be acknowledged. In my opinion that's a fatal flaw, so it needs to be well investigated. To make an effective case you need to be explain why social media monitoring would be a superior system to purpose-built PRO systems for chronic disease patients. I don't believe that the ease of capture outweighs the biased nature of the data, so if you do then you need to justify it, or propose some sort of blended model. I think your paper makes a good case for social media monitoring for studying health, but not for incorporation into the EMR.

It is very well written, and I think it can be improved through resubmission, and I encourage the authors to revise and resubmit.
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