Title: A Study on the Effects of Crowdfunding Values on the Intention to Visit Local Festivals: Focusing on Mediating Effects of Perceived Risk and e-WOM

Dear Editor and reviewers

Thank you very much and I deeply agree with your comments. Therefore, the paper was developed by basis of opinions from Editors and reviewers. Some comments were not fully reflected because of lacks of my abilities, but we did our best to make well the revision step. Thank you again for your valuable comment.

Specific Revision Regarding Comments from Reviewers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>reviewer comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-1</td>
<td>The same questionnaire applied to real participants would have probably produced different results. Therefore, this paper seems to be a good research exercise, but one should be careful with results, as their reliability is low. It is therefore advisable that this study is replicated in the real world with a real sample because otherwise, the whole paper is correct.</td>
<td>I agree with your opinion. In the future, replication studies should be conducted to prove the validity of this study. Our research team has already begun a phase to study for real participants of the film festival crowdfunding. These limitations should be explained in more detail in the manuscript. In response to your comments, we have added suggestions for future research. Below is fixed contents in the manuscript. We suggest that a replication study be conducted, using the same questionnaires that we used to verify the validity of our survey. This would ensure that the results of this study would hold for real participants in film festival crowdfunding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>I would suggest to read and cite a recent article which uses Perceived Risk as a key variable:</td>
<td>In response to your comments, we cited a recent article (Gemar, G.; Soler, I. P.; Melendez, L. Analysis of the intent to purchase travel on the web. Tourism &amp; Management Studies, 2019, 15, 23-33.). The study you suggested useful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for briefly explaining the mechanism of perceived risk. Below is added contents in the manuscript.

High risk perception means that consumers believe themselves more likely to suffer loss as a result of using a product or service. This potential for is expected to diminish consumer intentions or behaviors to buy products or services, especially in the online context [72]. Perceived risk thus leads to a negative causal relationship between consumption intentions.

1-3  As said before, English is correct. The only mistake I've found was in Table 2 (page 9) «crowdfunding will offers value for money». It is very easy to correct.

I found the mistake in table2 and revised it. I also mark revised texts in red color ('offers' to 'offer'). As final step in revision, I requested professional editor to check language errors in the manuscript. Thank you for your feedback.

Comments from Reviewer 2

Thank you very much for your feedback. We were able to identify many mistakes and problems. Thanks to your comments, we were able to significantly improve the research. Although your proposals are mostly meaningful, we have not reflected some of them. We apologize for not actively reflecting your comment. However, I would like to say that we did our best to revise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>reviewer comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2-1 | Introduction
- In line 74-76, the author stated “… the framework was not based on theories.” What does that mean? | I agree with your comment that A was not specific statement to understand our research framework. Therefore, some part in the introduction were improved. It was modified as follows.

This research model draws on the frameworks of several studies that examine factors influencing the intention to visit tourist destinations [16, 17]. These studies assume that measures of online consumer behavior, such as e-WOM [16] and blog usage [17], mediate explanatory variables relating to intention to visit tourist destinations. However, these works omit the impact of associations between one or
more online services and the intention to visit a tourist
destination. Online marketing tools show an important
diversity, and consumers are also able to receive tourism
information through a range of various online channels.
This indicates the importance of investigating the effects of
multiple marketing tools simultaneously. This study
considers the effects of e-WOM on SNS and of
crowdfunding as a marketing tool. This research examines
tourists’ perceptions, intentions, and actions as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2-2 | - please focus on e-WOM in tourism and
|      | festival or in cultural goods or services
|      | rather than general WOM. General
|      | WOM has different characteristics from
e-WOM, and e-WOM in general goods
could be also different from one of
tourism and services. It would be better
to address hypotheses focusing on
specific contexts according to the
research subject.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3. Innovativeness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| In the study of tourism and experience goods, direct
relationships between inner innovativeness and intention to
use e-WOM are hard to find. It has been suggested that
personal characteristics could affect intention to use e-
WOM in tourism [68]. Because inner innovativeness is a
personal characteristic whose relationship with intention to
use e-WOM has been verified in marketing studies, it can
be expected that inner innovativeness will affect intention
to use e-WOM in tourism.

2.5. Intention to use e-WOM
Abubakar et al. (2017) reported that e-WOM influences the

| Thanks for your comment. reflecting your comments, we revised '2.3. Innovativeness' and '2.5. Intention to use e-WOM'. We tried to describe reasonable relevance of the variables by adding prior studies which is related to the tourism. However, 2.3. In Innovativeness, we could not find a prior study that innovation affects e-WOM. So I think you can doubt the weak association between variables. Nevertheless, to improve the content, we have added a statement that highlights research on personal characteristics (inner innovativeness also one of the personal characteristics) and marketing research that has already been reviewed in first draft). |
intention to re-visit the medical tourism industry [86].
Previous studies have found that those who share a positive message on the elements of a tourist experience with others are more likely to be immersed in tourism information or to have a positive understanding of it. In this sharing process, positive images can be created that arouse intention to visit [16]. It can be expected that this mechanism will appear here as it has elsewhere.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- When you write WOM please specify it is WOM or e-WOM through the whole paper.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thanks for your comment.

'WOM' word is used 85 times in the manuscript. Prior studies we reviewed are related with both WOM researches and e-WOM researches. We decided to keep expression 'WOM' for WOM studies. However, we realized that we sometimes made the mistake using WOM expression for e-WOM researches. In these case, we revised 'WOM' to 'e-WOM'.

For expressing coherently, we used 'e-WOM' in the Introduction, Research method, Result, Discussion and Conclusion. Revised words were marked in red.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Please provide operational definitions of constructs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We added operational definitions of eight variables in 3.2. Measurement and Analysis Method.

The economic value describes how far it is perceived that film festival crowdfunding can provide monetary value. The emotional value describes how far it is perceived that the film festival crowdfunding can lead to a positive emotional state. The social value describes how far one expects to be recognized by social contacts for participating in the film festival crowdfunding. Economic, emotional, and social value were revised based on the Sweeney and Soutar (2001) study on shopping value [38]. The altruistic value describes how far one believes that film festival crowdfunding participation will help others. To measure the altruistic value, we considered items from Holbrook’s (2006) study of the applicability of subjective personal
introspection factors in consumption experience [88]. Inner innovativeness is “the degree to which an individual is receptive to new ideas and makes innovation decisions independently of the communicated experience of others.” [52, p. 236]. Items of inner innovativeness were revised based on Chang, Lee, and Kim's (2006) study, which examined factors that influence online game adoption [54]. In an e-service adoption study, Featherman and Pavlou (2003) proposed seven types of risks, such as performance, financial, time, psychological, social, privacy, and overall risks [75]. Among them, the items of financial risk by Featherman and Pavlou (2003) were used in the study [75]. Perceived risk describes much one expects to lose in relation to money for participating in film festival crowdfunding. Online word-of-mouth behavior is divided into opinion giving, opinion passing, and opinion seeking [89]. In this study, opinion passing was considered as observed e-WOM. E-WOM describes the willingness to share festival crowdfunding information with others on SNS. We used items based on research from Sun et al. (2006), Chu and Choi (2012), and Lee and Lee (2013) [67, 90, 91]. Finally, intention to visit the film festival describes the willingness to visit a local film festival in the near future. To measure this, we used the items of Perugini and Bagozzi (2001), which were based on the theory of planned behavior [92]. All questions in this study consisted of the Likert five-point scale (1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree). Three items were contained for each variable (See Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thanks for your comments.
I missed ‘explanation of analysis’ which the most basic and important part. We added the explanation of analysis as follows to reflect your opinion.

The general characteristics of the samples are identified using SPSS18 statistical software. In particular, frequency analysis and composite reliability were performed to verify the reliability of the measurement questions. Next, this
The study utilized the structural equation model (SEM). The statistical software Amos 20 was used to carry out the calculations. SEM enacts multi-equation system procedures, determining multiple indicators of concepts, continuous latent variables, errors in equations, errors of measurement, and continuous latent variables [93]. This is useful for comprehensively examination of relationships among multiple variables, as needed in this study. First, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed to check the latent variables and ensure the absence of measurement errors by CFA. Next, the relationship between the variables was examined through the structural model.

Thank you.

I made a mistake. As you say, SV has a positive effect on PR. Therefore, this result does not support the hypothesis. In this regard, the part of results related with H1-3 has been corrected.

Thank you for your suggestion. I used ‘not supported’ instead of ‘rejected’. Table 6 and manuscript were modified.

Thank you very much. There was an unintended mistake in discussion and conclusion. through your comments, We had a chance to correct mistakes. The study results were reviewed once again. We corrected the wrong part. In addition, we partially improved the insufficient content. Based on the accurate analysis results, the contents were modified as follows.

First of all, emotional values (H1–2) and altruistic values (H1–4) negatively affected perceived risk. This supports the findings of previous studies, which indicate that individuals perceive low levels of risk when they have a sense of worth regarding a given service or product [46]. These variables are commonly considered to be related to emotional characteristics rather than to cognitive ones. These results indicate that consumers are more likely to
obtain emotional value as a result of the crowdfunding of cultural products, such as festival crowdfunding. Another notable aspect is that the path coefficient for emotional value (B = -0.401) was higher than the altruistic value (B = -0.306). This implies that emotional value has greater explanatory power. Future studies should develop this framework by developing detailed factors for emotional value. Interestingly, economic value effects were not confirmed. It is expected that the effects of economic value varies in relation to the type of crowdfunding. Moysidou and Spaeth’s (2016) study, which examined the impact of economic value on behavioral intention by project type, found an influence of economic value in revenue-based crowdfunding, such as equity-based and loan-based projects [41]. Individuals may not take economic value into account for donation-based or reward-based crowdfunding, including cultural goods. Economic relates to the amount of monetary benefit that an individual can receive. Individuals do not generally seek financial benefits when they participate in donation and reward-based crowdfunding. Rather, they seek to meet non-monetary needs, such as social approval or self-realization [43]. In particular, individuals’ non-monetary motivations are likely to be more prominent in cultural goods, such as in relation to local film festival crowdfunding, which mainly has non-commercial purposes.

| **Discussion and Conclusion** | I agree with your opinion. It was unreasonable to discuss about e-WOM through McKee et al. (2006)’ research. Therefore, we revised the overall statement regarding e-WOM paragraph in discussion and conclusion. |
| **2-9** | For hypotheses 2-1 to 2-4, only social values (H2–3) positively affected the intention to use e-WOM. Social values and intention to use e-WOM both rest on the concept of social relationships. This result means that perception of the value of interacting with others through participation in |

The authors provided previous studies in order to support the results or compare the results with others. However, the relevance of literature the authors stated is doubtful. For example, McKee et al. (2006) studied only economic value and confirmed that economic value positively affects intention to use WOM in the context of a group health care plan.
McKee et al.’s study cannot support the results of this study since hypothesis of EV on e-WOM was not supported and it cannot be extended to other hypotheses. I don’t understand what aspects of McKee et al.’s study can support your research.

Festival crowdfunding can affect social interactions using online. Prior studies have found that perception of quality in the general product area, such as food, can affect WOM [49]. On the other hand, social value effects were identified in this study. It is unclear whether these results can be attributed to the nature of the experience or to crowdfunding type. Further research is needed.

We drastically modified some lines in discussion and conclusion you asked to reconsider. We have mainly improved by focusing specifically on areas with explanations.

**Discussion and Conclusion**

Some explanation of the results should be reconsidered

We drastically modified some lines in discussion and conclusion you asked to reconsider. We have mainly improved by focusing specifically on areas with explanations.

**line 430-435**

Last, the intention to use e-WOM also had a positive effect on the intention to visit the film festival (H6). This result is consistent with previous studies that have suggested that e-WOM has a positive effect on travel intention [15, 17]. The action to share the usefulness of festival crowdfunding with friends is believed to be based on trust or interest in the film festival. This means that positive perceptions of the film festival can lead to real action, such as visiting a festival. However, there is also the possibility that control variables may have some bearing on the intention to use e-WOM and the intention to visit a film festival. For example, actual behavior may vary depending on perceived involvement in film festivals or crowdfunding platforms. Future research will be needed to expand the research model by exploring moderating variables.

**line 457-459**

As for H5 and H6, earlier study of tourism crowdfunding used crowdfunding behavior as a dependent variable. Our study, however, set the intention to visit a festival as outcome variable, not crowdfunding behavior, and found that it is affected by explanatory variables. This means that the effects on the service platform can affect consumers’
behavior in relation to the topic of crowdfunding beyond the platform. If individuals have a positive perception of crowdfunding services, this may indirectly indicate that they have a positive perception of crowdfunding as well as of the service platform. Therefore, crowdfunding goes beyond investment to acting as a marketing tool, attracting individual visits to local film festivals and further enhancing the sustainability of local film festivals.

This study has theoretical implications. First, previous work has examined factors affecting the intention to participate in festival crowdfunding [99, 100], but overall, too little work has been done on the effects of crowdfunding in tourism. Additionally, from a marketing perspective, few analyses or in-depth discussions of festival crowdfunding have been done. This study is thus an important examination of the influence of tourism crowdfunding. Second, this study proposed a framework to examine the marketing effects of crowdfunding in tourism. It has been confirmed that the influence of certain variables varies depending on the type of crowdfunding being considered. As noted, we found that emotional factors should be taken seriously in the study of donation-based and reward-based crowdfunding. If this framework is properly modified in response to the results of this study, festival-visiting behavior can be explained in greater detail. Third, to supplement existing research trends, structural modeling is proposed in relation to perceived risk and e-WOM as mediating variables between value factors and behavioral intentions. This approach can provide a useful aid to studies dealing with online communication environments and platforms with high uncertainty, such as crowdfunding platforms.
In line 460, the authors stated “a general study reported that attitudes towards crowdfunding affect the intention of crowdfunding behavior.” what do you mean by general study? I don’t see related literature focusing on crowdfunding regarding H5 and H6. didn't provide a reference. In the improved paragraph, we tried to provide citations and to give a detailed explanation of the results. Thank you very much for your comments.

As for H5 and H6, earlier study of tourism crowdfunding used crowdfunding behavior as a dependent variable. Our study, however, set the intention to visit a festival as outcome variable, not crowdfunding behavior, and found that it is affected by explanatory variables. This means that the effects on the service platform can affect consumers’ behavior in relation to the topic of crowdfunding beyond the platform. If individuals have a positive perception of crowdfunding services, this may indirectly indicate that they have a positive perception of crowdfunding as well as of the service platform. Therefore, crowdfunding goes beyond investment to acting as a marketing tool, attracting individual visits to local film festivals and further enhancing the sustainability of local film festivals.

We also admitted the explanation for theoretical implications is insufficient. Thus, the whole paragraph on theoretical implications was quite improved.

This study has theoretical implications. First, previous work has examined factors affecting the intention to participate in festival crowdfunding [99, 100], but overall, too little work has been done on the effects of crowdfunding in tourism. Additionally, from a marketing perspective, few analyses or in-depth discussions of festival crowdfunding have been done. This study is thus an important examination of the influence of tourism crowdfunding.

Discussion and Conclusion

in line 471-472, the authors stated “we ... found that the influence of these factors is somewhat different than indicated by the existing crowdfunding research.” Please fully provide related existing crowdfunding research.

2-12
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Discussion and Conclusion

We also admitted the explanation for theoretical implications is insufficient. Thus, the whole paragraph on theoretical implications was quite improved.

This study has theoretical implications. First, previous work has examined factors affecting the intention to participate in festival crowdfunding [99, 100], but overall, too little work has been done on the effects of crowdfunding in tourism. Additionally, from a marketing perspective, few analyses or in-depth discussions of festival crowdfunding have been done. This study is thus an important examination of the influence of tourism crowdfunding.

Second, this study proposed a framework to examine the marketing effects of crowdfunding in tourism. It has been confirmed that the influence of certain variables varies depending on the type of crowdfunding being considered. As noted, we found that emotional factors should be taken seriously in the study of donation-based and reward-based
If this framework is properly modified in response to the results of this study, festival-visiting behavior can be explained in greater detail. Third, to supplement existing research trends, structural modeling is proposed in relation to perceived risk and e-WOM as mediating variables between value factors and behavioral intentions. This approach can provide a useful aid to studies dealing with online communication environments and platforms with high uncertainty, such as crowdfunding platforms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion and Conclusion</th>
<th>I wonder why your explanation suddenly moves to attitudes on discussion.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In view of your opinion, we have decided that the expression 'perception' is more appropriate than the expression 'attitude'. The word 'attitude' are shown in mainly ‘Regarding H5 and H6… ’ paragraph. So this paragraph was revised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Innovativeness affecting WOM could be multi-dimensional such as social and cognitive innovativeness. Can we give some meaningful insight with only one aspect of innovativeness or one aspect of personal characteristics without considering others confirmed by previous studies?

You are right. Inner innovativeness can be divided into various dimensions. Previous studies have sometimes divided inner innovativeness into several dimensions. In the previous study, inner innovativeness was divided into idea dimension and fashion dimension. The idea dimension is about technology, and the fashion dimension is about brand or image. Nevertheless, this study applied only one dimension. This is because the segmentation of inner innovativeness is still at its initial level. Your comments will be useful to researchers in the future. Therefore, it was suggested to subsequent studies that the influence of inner innovativeness should be examined in multi-dimension.

Finally, future studies should be conducted that investigate multi-dimensional inner innovativeness. Certain studies have also reviewed how well individuals accept brands or images related to innovation [54], but these have mainly involved emotional indicators, so to examine the effects of inner innovativeness, both cognitive and emotional perspectives should be considered.

The authors did not consider the unique...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>characteristics of crowdfunding and did not show operational definition of perceived risk. First, provide why the authors consider only economical/financial risk.</th>
<th>We did not specifically explain why economic risk was considered as mediating variable. Added as below.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This study also considers perceived economic risk as a mediator. Although most festival crowdfunding is for donation-based or reward-based crowdfunding, this relates strictly to monetary spending. Thus, regardless of whether the rewards provided by crowdfunding managers are psychological or material, individuals can compare monetary expenditures and rewards. If the value of the perceived reward of a donation is lower than the monetary expenditure, perceived risk is likely to appear [71]. Thus, we consider that economic risk is a major variable because such risk is triggered by individual monetary spending.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An operational definition was also added</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived risk describes much one expects to lose in relation to money for participating in film festival crowdfunding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree with you. It is difficult to explain the intention to visit with the risk of crowdfunding only. There will be various factors explaining the intention to visit. Various variables will need to be considered in future studies. Your feedback was discussed in the limitation part as a guide for subsequent researchers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next, follow-up studies should take a closer look at the effects of other factors on the intention to visit a film festival. Potential consumers will recognize not only the risks directly related to the festival but also the risks of the crowdfunding investment in their decision to visit the festival. Thus, in addition to the perceived risk of participation in film festival crowdfunding, risks associated with the consumption behaviors that that are seen during participation in the festival should also be considered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the hypothesis 5 is the relationship between perceived risk and the intention to visit, perceived economic risk is not only buying a ticket or some goods in crowdfunding. Festival participation is a complex product with consumption of food and beverage, accommodation, transportation, etc. The authors ignore economic risk related to other expenditures.

2-16
I wonder why the authors see the relationship between risk and the intention to visit not participating crowdfunding. In this perspective, I wonder why the authors chose the intention to visit not participating crowdfunding.

The focus of this study is the influence of crowdfunding as a festival (tourism) marketing tool. We believe that in the future, as much as social media, crowdfunding will be a platform that will provide festival information to potential visitors and generate interest of festival. Therefore, we assumed that potential consumers would go through the following cognitive mechanism.

```
Highly aware of the value of crowdfunding -> Positive recognition of various festivals (tourism) information in crowdfunding -> Intention to actually visit the festival which is the topic of crowdfunding
```

However, we assume that the crowdfunding platform is influential as a tool to promote the topics covered by crowdfunding (festival in this study). The influence of crowdfunding as a marketing tool has already been mentioned literature review. It also stated additionally why we considered Intention to visit film festival as a dependent variable at the revision stage. Below is a revised statement.

This research model draws on the frameworks of several studies that examine factors influencing the intention to visit tourist destinations [16, 17]. These studies assume that measures of online consumer behavior, such as e-WOM [16] and blog usage [17], mediate explanatory variables relating to intention to visit tourist destinations. However, these works omit the impact of associations between one or more online services and the intention to visit a tourist destination. Online marketing tools show an important diversity, and consumers are also able to receive tourism information through a range of various online channels. This indicates the importance of investigating the effects of multiple marketing tools simultaneously. This study considers the effects of e-WOM on SNS and of crowdfunding as a marketing tool. This research examines tourists’ perceptions, intentions, and actions as a whole.
Given the continuing increase in the impact of information technology services in the tourism industry, it will help to increase sustainability in the regional tourism industry with unstable conditions.

For another reason, At the time of study design, it was reasonable to apply 'The intention to participate crowdfunding' as a dependent variable of this study. However, we have finally decided that it is right to put in a dependent variable that is consistent with the purpose of the Sustainable Tourism in the Social Media and Big Data Era, a special session in the Journal of Sustainability. If we set 'The intention to participate crowdfunding' as a dependent variable, this research might be considered a media or technology adoption study.

Thanks for your comment. At the time of study design, we considered the relationship between perceived risk and e-WOM. As a result of reviewing previous studies, many studies also argue that perceived risk can negatively affect e-WOM. Nevertheless, this study attempted to focus on other pathways that prior studies did not pay much attention to, rather than the relationship between perceived risk and e-WOM that has been consistently demonstrated in previous studies. Finally, we analyzed the current research model excluding the relationship between perceived risk and e-WOM. At the revision stage, we took into account your comments and analyzed the model, including the relationship between perceived risk and e-WOM. The model fit was significant. The model fit results are shown below.

\[ \chi^2/df = 2.551, \text{RMSEA} = .059, \text{AGFI} = .868, \text{CFI} = .950, \text{TLI} = .939, \text{NFI} = .920 \]

However, contrary to our expectations, perceived risk was found to have a positive effect on e-WOM \( (B = 0.116, \rho < \)
According to previous studies, it is correct that a negative relationship between two variables is shown. The researchers looked at how to interpret the results, but did not get a clear answer. Therefore, the researchers found it effective to maintain the existing model. Sorry for not reflecting your opinion, despite it being quite meaningful.

According to Midgley and Dowling (1978), inner innovativeness refers to "the degree to which an individual is receptive to new ideas and makes innovation decisions independently of the communicated experience of others." We applied the research item of Chang et al. (2006)'s research considering the research of Midgley and Dowling (1978). Inner innovativeness refers to the characteristics of an individual, and this is not limited to product or purchase conditions. The meaning of this is quite broad. This study also tried to examine the effect of inner innovativeness as a comprehensive concept. The main purpose of this study was to find out the effects of two components: the characteristics of the crowdfunding and the personal factors. Nevertheless, as your opinion, the inner innovativeness should be more specifically operationalized and applied to future studies. In future studies, we will define inner innovativeness in detail by reflecting your opinion. We added an operational definition of inner innovativeness to the manuscript.

I agree with your opinion. In future studies, it will be necessary to make the subject of the study clearly visible in the measurement. One way is to divide risk into two dimensions. One variable is the risk of future festival participation, and the other is a risk factor for crowdfunding participation. Unfortunately, we applied two parameters, e-WOM and risk. Therefore, it is expected that considering a large number of mediating variables will lower the suitability of the research model. Although your proposal is very reasonable, we have not improved the measurement part. We are so sorry.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>reviewer comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-1</td>
<td>Nonetheless, in the introduction, there are not enough arguments supporting their approach, and it would be nice to present possible theoretical gaps or similar research.</td>
<td>Thanks for your specific comment. We tried to improve introduction part which was needed to make enough arguments supporting our approach. Our research is based on prior studies that utilize consumer online activities as a mediating variable. To examine this, we found related studies and reviewed. The improved introductions explain our research model and purpose more clearly. Revised words were marked in red.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Issue Description</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>The citation “Featherman and Pavlou (2003)” is not consistent throughout the paper.</td>
<td>Thanks for your comment. I revised Featherman and Pavlou (2003) to Featherman and Pavlou (2003). The modified texts were marked in red.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>The title of Hoksbergen &amp; Insch (2016) paper in the bibliography should be corrected.</td>
<td>Thanks for your comment. I corrected title of Hoksbergen &amp; Insch (2016) paper from “Facebook as a platform for co-creating music festival experiences” to “Facebook as a platform for co-creating music festival experiences: The case of New Zealand’s Rhythm and Vines New Year’s Eve festival”. The modified texts were marked in red.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>