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Manuscript Number: SON-D-22-00051     
How Twitter divides the Dutch parliament: Segregation along party lines and social dimensions in the following, @-mentions and retweets Twitter Networks of Dutch MPs   
Dear Dr Tolsma,      
Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Social Networks.   
I regret to inform you that the reviewers recommend against publishing your manuscript, and I must therefore reject it. My comments, and any reviewer comments, are below.      
For alternative journals that may be more suitable for your manuscript, please refer to our Journal Finder ([https://urldefense.com/v3/\_\_http://journalfinder.elsevier.com\_\_;!!HJOPV4FYYWzcc1jazlU!-ptqLQYdAAHxHQYukpR0nu6eznJ\_Ypcvd2k-KYNQyeaoc3-qpVNgA19V1NJHyo11TDlRWTMFqDI2P9KuwPk$](https://urldefense.com/v3/__http:/journalfinder.elsevier.com__;!!HJOPV4FYYWzcc1jazlU!-ptqLQYdAAHxHQYukpR0nu6eznJ_Ypcvd2k-KYNQyeaoc3-qpVNgA19V1NJHyo11TDlRWTMFqDI2P9KuwPk$) ).   
We appreciate you submitting your manuscript to Social Networks and thank you for giving us the opportunity to consider your work.     Kind regards,     Martin Everett   Co-Editor   Social Networks       
Editor and Reviewer comments:      
  
  
Reviewer #1: Review: How Twitter divides the Dutch parliament: Segregation along party lines and social dimensions in the following, @-mentions and retweets Twitter networks of Dutch MPs   
This article investigates segregation in Twitter networks among Dutch MPs. The article presents a clear problem statement. The data is interesting. And the methods are innovative. On that basis, I think the article has the potential to make a relevant contribution to the extant literature in the field. I have, however, some comments and suggestions for the authors:   
a) Highlights: It is not Twitter that offers democratic potential, but MPs' use of Twitter. b) Title: same issue here, Twitter does not divide the Dutch parliament. c) Introduction: the contributions of the study (p. 3) should be clarified. Also, there is a clear need to update the literature sources. For example, Esteve Del Valle et al., (2021) recently published an article in which they analyze the formation of communication ties and the degree of homophily in the Dutch MPs' mention Twitter network. Hekim (2021) employed ERG models to study the retweet networks among Turkish politicians. And Koiranen et al., (2019) conducted an interesting analysis of the Finish followee network. Last, I do think that the article by Esteve Del Valle and Borge (2018) theorizes homophily in Twitter parliamentary networks, so I would appreciate if the authors can elaborate on their assertion ("all above mentioned studies did not move beyond the valuable descriptive, they did not theorize nor test…" p. 3) in which they express the opposite. d) Theoretical background: a lot has been written on segregation and Twitter parliamentary networks during the last 5 years. Nevertheless, I only see few references to these works in the authors' "Multi-dimensionality: Segregation in Twitter along political and social dimensions" sub-section. I thus suggest updating this sub-section accordingly (see point c above). Also, I wonder whether adding a paragraph on the particular characteristics of parliamentary networks (see Esteve Del Valle & Borge, 2018) could help the reader better understand the authors' research. e) Data and methods: The authors should provide three or four arguments explaining the relevance of studying Dutch MPs' communications on Twitter. Also, moving the explanations of the Dutch political parties (p.6) to the section "Data and methods" would help increase the readability of the text. More importantly, the authors need to theoretically anchor (subsection "Analytical Strategy") the choice of the structural parameters and of the control variables in previous literature in the field (see Esteve Del Valle et al., 2021). d) Limitations: the authors seem to only point one limitation (p. 33). I however observe several limitations which should be discussed. First, the authors are comparing one electoral period with two non-electoral periods. Second, the use of the network parameters and the control variables could be refined (e.g. reducing the number of network parameters and adding new control variables). And third, the data collection period is quite short. All in all, I think the authors wrote an interesting manuscript, but it needs to be carefully revised.   
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Reviewer #2: This paper presents an interesting analysis of online relations in the Dutch parliament. The analysis is thorough and seems technically sound (although I'm not an SAOM expert). As such, the paper provides an interesting insight in the social processes in the Dutch Parliament. Nevertheless, my overall impression is that the theoretical contribution of the paper is eventually (too) limited. It is essentially a case study, which may be valuable if it used to develop or test a theory in an informative way, so that it can be generalized to other contexts. It is not clear that such is the case here. Most of the hypotheses seem somewhat ad hoc and tailor-made for this particular environment; it is not clear to me how the testing of these hypotheses leads to a better understanding of the role of social media more broadly, beyond the specific context of the one parliament. I think this also shows in the highlights; most of these seem somewhat trivial to anyone with a  
basic understanding of common Twitter behaviors among politicians (that is, Twitter is a vehicle for promotion of political content, retweets constitute endorsements, and political affiliation is more important than identification with demographic categories).   
I also note that the paper seems to claim more than it delivers at some points: for example the final highlight claims "Twitter offers democratic potential in terms of forging new connections", although "democratic potential" is not actually studied.   
Some more specific comments and suggestions:  
  
a. Data are relatively old; in the meantime there have been elections in the Netherlands. Why not (also) look at the latest parliament?   
b. Operationalization of ethnicity not very convincing. How likely is it that MPs base their behavior on only \*visible\* ethnic markers? Also, from a theoretical point of view, it does not seem plausible that "ethnic minority background" would be a relevant dimension of homophily.  
  
c. The descriptive analysis of segregation starts with a density-based analysis, which, as you also note, is flawed because it does not take group sizes into account. Then why use it at all? Furthermore, you use both Coleman's segregation measure and Newman's assortativity index. However, as Bojanowski and Corten (2014) also mention, only the former seems appropriate for contexts where the network is (conceptually) subject to change while node attributes are stable. Why not simply rely on the most appropriate measure?  
  
d. Overall, the first part of the results section contains a lot of description for which the added value to the overall story line of the paper is not always clear. I would suggest to look critically at this section, and keep only the parts that are really needed to make your point.  
  
e. I'm not entirely convinced of the visualization approach in which the seating layout is used as a basis. Since most of the ties can be expected to be within parties and between parties that are ideologically close (which I think are then also seated close to each other), the interaction patterns are visually "buried" because nodes that interact a lot are already positioned close together. I think it could be more interesting to let a visualization algorithm determine node placement, which would then illustrate that interaction patterns indeed largely reproduce the seating arrangement.   
f. Table 4 does not provide any indicators of significance tests. This makes the results somewhat hard to follow.  
  
g. Although I am not a SAOM expert, I wondered whether it would be useful to control for the overall (individual) level of Twitter activity in the models, perhaps both for ego and alter. E.g., someone who tweets a lot is generally more likely to retweet or mention others, but conversely one also needs to tweet before one can be retweeted.  
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