

Your Reply

Andri Dayarana K. Silalahi 02.06.2022

Response to Editor Thank you for your insightful comments and suggestions. In accordance with editor recommendations, we have added references to articles published in Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies (HBET). Several articles related to the subject of this manuscript have been reviewed and added. Finally, we cite two articles to support our argument regarding the need to gain a better understanding of consumer responses to emerging technologies. The articles published on HBET are clearly of high quality. It is our hope that the changes we have made will satisfy the editors and meet the requirements for publication in Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies.

Response to Reviewer 1. Thank you once again for giving me the opportunity to review the resubmission. The authors have sufficiently incorporated my comments. The article suffices the requirements scientifically. However, I have a few comments related to its clarity and better presentation.

Response: Thank you for your valuable remarks regarding the manuscript. The authors realized that all of the suggestions and recommendations provided by the reviewers are intended to improve the quality of the manuscript. Therefore, we have attempted to address point by point what reviewers have suggested to improve the manuscript. Hopefully, all revisions made have been satisfactory to the reviewers and meet the requirements for publication in Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies.

2. The authors have combined h1ab, H2ab, etc, they are required to mention in the bracket whether it's a or b for example: H1a&b: a) Visual and b) auditory cues on the YouTube product reviews influence parasocial interactions with the YouTuber. The same approach can be used for all of the hypotheses.

Response: Thank you for these valuable suggestions. We find in the manuscript that it is not a good presentation for the manuscript when the hypothesis is combined without any precise symbolic notation. Therefore, we highly welcome these comments, and changes have been made to the manuscript. Especially in the hypothesis section, we have separated the hypothesis if they are combined with the bracket. The changes are highlighted in blue in the manuscript.

3. There are a few grammatical errors, the article needs to be thoroughly corrected.

Response: Thank you for these valuable comments. We have understood that to improve the manuscript for publication, it should have a good presentation, including grammar and how it is written. Therefore, we highly accept these comments and proofread the manuscript to the professional English and Editing Company. We also attached the certification of the manuscript, which proves that professionals have proofread it. We hope that we satisfactorily addressed the reviewer's suggestions to the manuscript through this.

4. The following paragraph in the methodology is based on the future tense, which suggests that the research will be done in the future, it's better to formulate in the past or present perfect tense. "This research implements a nonprobability sampling technique and selects research participants through a purposive sampling method. The participants must have purchased a particular product based on YouTube reviews to be eligible to fill out the questionnaire. Two preliminary questions have been included in the questionnaire to ensure that participants have experience purchasing products after watching product reviews on YouTube. Participants will be asked whether