REVISION NOTE

The Importance of Social influencer-generated Contents for user cognition and Emotional Attachment: An Information Relevance Perspective

[Ref. No. sustainability- 1662179.R2]

Responses to Reviewer 1

Thank you for revising the manuscript based on the peer review comments. The argument of the manuscript has been clarified. However, there are still several points that need to be corrected. Please take the following comments into consideration.

We appreciate your kind comments on our manuscript. There is no doubt that these comments are very important and very beneficial for revising and improving our manuscript. We'd like to address the issues you mentioned and provide a thorough overview of the modifications made to the original manuscript in the sections that follow. We hope you agree to our revised manuscript.

page 7, line 384: 3.2 Information quality/Par.3:
The way of line break of this paragraph ("Accordingly, this study...") is not standardized with the other subsections. If there is no particular intention, the author(s) should be unified.

Thank you for pointing this out. According to your suggestion, we checked and corrected it to ensure that it was consistent with the other subsections. The updated contents are presented on the manuscript from page 7, line 342 to line 343.

page 7, line 387: 3.2 Information quality/Par.3:
The rules for numbering hypotheses here are unclear. It should eventually be corrected with a unified numbering manner.

Thank you for your significant reminding. According to your suggestion we altered the order of the hypotheses to make them more readable and sequentially. The updated contents are presented on the manuscript from page 7, line 344 to line 349.

page 7, line 407: 3.4 Reserach Model/Par.1:
The sentence "This study does not consider..." does not sound like a rational reason. A more

rational reason for building such a research model should be explained.

Thank you for your valuable counsel. According to your suggestion, we reinterpreted the establishment of the research model. The following is the modified content:

"The term "information quality" measures the accuracy of content generated on the personal accounts of social media influencers in the study. However, the information interestingness and information novelty have a minimal impact on information accuracy. As a result, we put greater emphasis on the impact of information reliability and understandability on information quality in this study, rather than the impact of information interestingness and information novelty on information quality." (page 8, line 376 – 382)

page 7, line 424: 3.4 Reserach Model/Fig.1

Some hypotheses explain the correlation perspective and thus cannot be directly adapted to the causal structure shown in this figure. This is because correlation has no direction. Therefore, if some hypotheses are to be aligned with this research model, they must be assumed to be causal.

Thank you for your significant reminding. According to your suggestion, we reorganized the description about hypothesis section to more accurately show causal relationships between variables. The updated contents are presented on the manuscript (page 6, line 251 – 256; page 6, line 269 – 275; page 6, line 281 – 284; page 6, line 293 – 295; page 7, line 306 – 320; page 7, line 335 – 342).

page 7, line 424: 4. Methodology

In the review manuscript of my side, the line does not appear to be broken.

Thank you for pointing this out. According to your suggestion, we double-checked and made necessary corrections.

page 8, line 467: 4.2.Sample.../Par.3:

The author(s) should explain from what population they sampled the data in Korea this time. Was the data obtained by random sampling from the entire Korean population?

Thank you for your valuable counsel. According to your suggestion, we supplemented the content with information regarding the data collection processes utilized in this study. The followings are our updated results and we hope you agree to our revised manuscript:

"Participants were recruited using the snowball sampling method. Initially, the researchers recruited participants by sharing questionnaire links and publicizing the study's purpose on their own social media accounts. Second, participants were invited to share questionnaire links with friends and relatives to increase the number of participants and eliminate selection bias. Additionally, participation was anonymous and voluntary in order to avoid bias." (page 10, line 486 – 491)

page 8, line 579:

The values of R2 do not seem high. This perspective should also be mentioned in the discussion section. For instance, since this is a survey of various types of social media influencers, please consider the possibility that it may be difficult to extract a unified trend.

Thank you for your valuable comments. According to your suggestion we added some description to the discussion section to explain the R^2 values in this study. The followings are our updated results:

"Fourth, previous research suggested that R^2, which is used to evaluate prediction accuracy, ranges from 0 to 1, with higher values indicating better prediction performance [79]. The R^2 values in this study are not exceptionally high as all the values of R^2 are less than 0.2. Although this finding is applicable to the scope of influencer marketing research. However, the results in other fields of research may be different. Because the value of R^2 is usually correlated to the complexity of the model and the research discipline [79]." (page 19 , line 691 - 696)

page 13, line 612: Fig.2

It should describe what the numbers in the parenthesis of the path represent.

Thank you for your valuable comments. According to your suggestion we noted the meaning of the number in parenthesis in Figure 2. (page 17, line 638)

page 13, line 633: 6. Discussion/Par.2:

The author(s) claim that information quality has more influence on recommendation intention than emotional attachment, but Figure 2 shows that emotional attachment seems to have a stronger

influence on recommendation intention than information quality. The claim here should be stated in a way that clearly shows how it is based on the results.

Thank you for pointing this out. As a consequence of your recommendation, we checked the findings and discovered that we did not explain this clearly in the discussion. The findings indicated that the information quality has a greater effect on customers' intention to follow an influencer than emotional attachment does. As a result, we rephrased this statement as follows:

"Furthermore, information quality is more likely to drive people to follow an influencer than emotional attachment is." (page 18, line 670 – 671)