Dear editor,

We would like to thank the editor and the reviewers for the time spent reviewing our paper and for the comments they have provided which have, in our opinion, helped us improve the paper and clarify some points that were not well explained in the previous version.

Our point-to-point answers to the reviewers' comments are shown as follows.

Please do not hesitate to contact us should you require any further information.

Reviewer 2

The authors present a very interesting paper. They start with a nice and clear title.

I consider it should be accepted in the present form although my minor comments could be included in the final proofreading. I hope they can help to improve the paper.

We would like to thank the reviewer for this encouraging comment.

- Page 2: "To conduct infodemiolgy studies it is necessary to find data sources...". This is a very interesting paragraph. I miss some updated references, though, besides [3].

We have expanded this information with more detail about the current references and try to complete it with updated references.

- page 4, table 1: Sometimes there are classifications with neutral but here it is not the case? why?

We agree with the reviewer that there are other studies in sentiment analysis with the neutral classification. In our case we have performed the study just with positive and negative tweets to show how these models work in these domains. Besides, in infectious diseases domain, it is very difficult to distinguish between neutral or negative tweets because news related to an outbreak is usually negative and it is very difficult to manually tagged a balanced corpus. As future work we have included the need to develop a study including also neutral tweets as the reviewer suggests.

Nice balanced corpus with 3,090 tweets pos and 3,090 tweets neg, but, out of interest, how did you manage to have it done?

The explanation of how the corpus have been compiled and manually tagged is now explained in detail in section 3.

- Page 5. well described, it is true RF and SOM are good classifiers. However, I think it could be better argued the decision besides "they were applied in the past to perform NLP [24]". Also because this is not a recent reference.

The arguments of using both classifiers have been extended in the paper and the references has been updated.

There is a good experimentation section.

We would like to thank the reviewer for this encouraging comment.

Future work. Although it is an interesting point, I miss a longer statement of future lines, especially in this type of project. Perhaps data integration, as well as ontologies, could take part in it and also more included in the manuscript as keywords in this context.

The future work section has been extended including more information about future researches including data integration, ontologies, citizen participation and also block-chain to measure the reliability of the data.