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| PART 1: Comments |
|  | Reviewer’s comment**Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | Yes, this is very important to the scientific community as it tackles the critical issue of misinformation dissemination during a public health crisis, using a compelling case study—chlorine dioxide, a so-called “miracle cure” for COVID-19. It also highlights limitations with unsupervised and unstructured data gathering -raising issues of data integrity – false data from questionable sources.  |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The title clearly reflects the topic and central theme. However, the use of quotation marks around “Fake Miracle Cure” should be amended to reflect more neutrality, considering the paper explores how scientific legitimacy was falsely constructed. A suggested alternative (more neutral/scientific) title is:*“Dissemination of a Controversial COVID-19 ‘Miracle Cure’ on Twitter: The Case of Chlorine Dioxide”.* Note the word **fake** was removed from the title. |  |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | Yes, however the narrative needs to be written in shorter simpler sentences. Several sentences overly reflects the authors sentiments. Avoid complex phrasing like: *"it is no longer possible until proven otherwise to call chlorine dioxide a ‘false miracle cure’..."* – As no inferential statistics were used to gauge levels of significance – the statement cannot be a scientifically validated even with the disclaimer provided.Please consider shortening and structuring the abstract into clearly defined sections (background, method, results, conclusion). |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.**  | Yes the manuscript correctly deploys social media analytic modalities for content/sentiment analysis and use of Gephi. However – considering a multi disciplinary audience there is room to provide lay explanations so several terms be defined. See the sentence … *This approach then makes it possible to avoid defining categories a priori and thus avoid being far from the observ- able. Finally, this has the advantage of limiting the biases likely to influence the classifica- tion process*. This sentence is convuluted (the word avoid is used twice) with a few incomprehensible technical terms. The methodology is not clearly replicable – further information needed |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.****-** | The reference list is comprehensive and includes peer-reviewed sources, governmental warnings (e.g., FDA), and relevant theoretical frameworks (e.g., Peirce, Clifford).It cites recent and relevant studies (e.g., up to 2022), especially on social media misinformation and COVID-19. In addition, some of the referenced studies (particularly those supporting chlorine dioxide) are from low-impact or non-indexed journals. While this is appropriate but should be clearly flagged as potentially low credibility.Note that some references are incomplete or not properly formatted. Inconsistent reference style. Overuse of ‘available online” without datesThere are several ambigious references – without online urls. E.g “Coronavirus. n.d. MMS Testimonials. Available online...”Inconsistent or missing DOI. This should be corrected so that all journals have the DOI in the standard format.Several of the references do not have Publishers information or source titles. E.g Genesis II Church of Health and Healing. n.d. Infos. LinkedIn.co no retrieval information or date) |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | This is fair. There is the need for a professional language edit Some sentences are long and akward – need to be more consise. Some technical terms are used vaguely. Some words were used too frequently – e.g platform, avoidThe paragraphs need to be better linked for cohesion and comprehension. Inline references need to be better formatted and standardized as well. |  |
| Optional/General comments | This is a very important paper for public health discourse, however – its current presentation will require simpler sentences and better transition between paragraphs to ensure comprehension |  |
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