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Reviewer’s report:

Overall, the paper is well written and there are no major issues related to the quality of the paper. I have some minor issues that might need clarification or additional information.

The main aim of the paper is to test if mobile phones can be used to reach geographically dispersed respondents to identify opinion leaders. However, it appears that all respondents had to meet physically at one place and a paper list was used with names and codes. I wonder what the added value is of this method when respondents still had to come to a specific place where they as well could have completed the questionnaire directly. Or could this questionnaire also be delivered without a physical meeting? Clarification of this would help to understand the added value of this method better.

The authors measured both degree centrality and eigenvector centrality which resulted in the identification of the same most connected/influential person. Does this mean that one can simply say that the one with the most connections is the best opinion leader? And that the other measures do not really contribute to this selection process?

How were the degree centrality and eigenvector centrality calculated? Based on a combination of all the questions or separately per question?

Relates to figure 3; how should the lines and directions be interpreted? One line resembles a positive answer on one question, multiple lines on multiple questions? And what means the direction of the line? And how should we interpret a line pointing to the person himself? To summarize; a bit more help by the interpretation of the figure is welcome.

Related to the questionnaire, how was the option that they would go to no one integrated in the questionnaire? Was it first introduced? Was there a specific code for that?

The order of the tables/figures is not chronologically which is confusing
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