

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

Manuscript NO: 34277

Title: Mining twitter to understand the smoking cessation barriers

Reviewer's code: 00504962

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-04-12

Date reviewed: 2017-04-12

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|--|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | BPG Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | |
| | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors described mining Twitter to understand the smoking cessation barriers
The topic is important and very interesting.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

Manuscript NO: 34277

Title: Mining twitter to understand the smoking cessation barriers

Reviewer's code: 00227531

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-04-12

Date reviewed: 2017-04-18

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|---|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | | [Y] No | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | BPG Search: | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | |
| | | [Y] No | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting letter about the use of twitter and smoking cessation issues. However, although the authors claim that they have analyzed the twitter mining they do not provide any information on this matter apart from a few examples, they just point out the potential of twitter for smoking quitting. Please report how many twitters were about specific barriers for smoking cessation, how many about therapies....., how many could be defined as a positive message for other people, how many as a negative...