

For research article

Response to Reviewer 1 Comments

1. Summary

Thank you very much for the careful review and constructive feedback. We greatly appreciate the reviewer's detailed comments and thoughtful suggestions, which helped us improve the clarity, consistency, and methodological transparency of the manuscript. In the revised version, we have further refined the theoretical framing, corrected citation and formatting inconsistencies, improved the alignment between the title, hypotheses, and experimental design, expanded the reporting of statistical assumption checks, and carefully revised the discussion and practical implications sections for greater clarity and precision. All revisions have been incorporated into the manuscript and highlighted in the revised version.

2. Point-by-point response to Comments and Suggestions for Authors

Comments 1: *The overall framing has improved, but the central claim is still not fully aligned with the design. The revised manuscript now states more clearly that the review text remained unchanged and that only the labels and images were varied. This clarification is helpful. However, the title still emphasizes "The Impact of AI Disclosure," whereas the actual manipulation combines AI-related labels and visual cues. Because disclosure was not isolated as an independent factor, the title and some interpretive statements still appear somewhat stronger than the design can fully support.*

Response 1:

Thank you for this important comment. We agree that the previous title and some explanatory language may have implied a stronger focus on AI disclosure. In response, we have revised the title to better reflect the actual manipulation used in the study, not just the disclosure itself.

The revised title is: "AI Labels, Perceived Authenticity, and Consumer Trust in User-Generated Reviews".

Furthermore, we have revised the "Research Question," "Hypotheses," "Discussion," and "Limitations" sections to clarify that the study examines review scenarios with labels and AI-related cues, rather than the isolated effects of disclosure. We have also further clarified in the manuscript that the review text remained constant across all conditions and that the observed effects reflect the combined effects of labels, images, and cues across the experimental scenarios examined.

Comments 2: *A related issue remains in the wording of the hypotheses and the summary of results. For instance, Table 10 refers to "reviews labeled as human-created," but the baseline condition is more accurately described as a review presented without AI-related information, rather than a direct human-created label. This distinction is important and should be expressed more consistently throughout the*

manuscript.

Response 2: *Thank you for your attention to this important matter. We have revised the terminology used throughout the manuscript to ensure it is more accurately aligned with the experimental design. References to 'human-generated reviews' have been replaced with phrases such as 'review without AI-related information', including in the hypotheses, tables, discussion, appendices and summary of results. These changes have been made to improve conceptual clarity and consistency.*

Comments 3: *The reference system has not yet been fully corrected. The revised manuscript still contains visible citation errors, including examples such as "[1010]," "[19,20Error! Reference source not found.]," and "[10Error! Reference source not found.]." This remains an important presentation and quality-control issue and should be carefully resolved throughout the manuscript.*

Response 3: *Thank you for pointing this out. We carefully checked the entire manuscript and corrected all visible citation and cross-reference errors, including "[1010]" and the "Error! Reference source not found" cases. We also reviewed the reference formatting throughout the manuscript to ensure consistency.*

Comments 4: *The methods section is improved, but the reporting of assumption checks is still somewhat limited. The response letter mentions procedures such as Mauchly's test of sphericity and consideration of the Greenhouse-Geisser correction, but the revised manuscript does not clearly report the corresponding results. If these checks were conducted, their outcomes should be reported explicitly enough for readers to evaluate the analysis.*

Response 4: *Thank you for this helpful suggestion. We have now explicitly reported the assumption checks in the revised manuscript. Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption of sphericity was violated for both Consumer Trust and Perceived Authenticity; therefore, Greenhouse-Geisser corrections were applied. The corresponding results are now reported in the statistical analysis and hypothesis testing sections.*

Comments 5: *The discussion of measurement quality is now more careful, which I appreciate. However, some inconsistencies remain. The manuscript uses "AT1" in the main text, while Appendix B still reports "ATP1." In addition, the citation used for the AI transparency item still appears problematic, as the cited source is Podsakoff et al. (2003), which is a common method bias reference rather than a source for an AI disclosure or transparency measure. This point should be checked and corrected.*

Response 5: *Thank you for identifying these inconsistencies. We corrected the terminology inconsistency between "AT1" and "ATP1" throughout the manuscript and appendix materials. In addition, we revised the description of the AI Transparency Perception item and removed the problematic citation to Podsakoff et al. (2003) to avoid implying that it was the source of an AI disclosure or transparency measure.*

3. Response to Comments on the Quality of English Language

Response 1: Thank you for this comment. The manuscript has undergone an additional round of language and stylistic revision. We carefully reviewed the text to improve grammatical accuracy, clarity, consistency of terminology, and overall readability. Redundant and repetitive formulations were reduced, particularly in the discussion and practical implications sections.

For review article

Response to Reviewer 3 Comments

1. Summary

Thank you very much for your thoughtful and constructive feedback. We are very appreciative of the reviewer's detailed assessment and positive evaluation of the improvements made to the revised manuscript. Following the additional comments provided, we revised the manuscript further, paying particular attention to editorial consistency, theoretical clarity and language quality. We carefully corrected any remaining issues with the references and formatting, refined the Discussion and Practical Implications sections to reduce repetition and increase the depth of analysis, strengthened the consistency of the terminology used throughout the manuscript and conducted an additional round of linguistic and stylistic revisions to improve the text's readability and clarity. We also clarified the limitations related to the experimental design and the reliability of the measurements, ensuring a more cautious interpretation of the results.

2. Point-by-point response to Comments and Suggestions for Authors

Comments 1: *First, although many technical issues were corrected, the manuscript still contains unresolved referencing and formatting errors (e.g., "Error! Reference source not found."). The persistence of these issues at this stage of the review process is problematic and should be fully resolved before publication. A careful editorial revision of the entire manuscript is still required.*

Response 1:

Thank you for pointing this out. We have carefully reviewed the entire manuscript and corrected all remaining errors in the references, cross-references and formatting, including all instances of the 'Error! Reference source not found' error. We also conducted a full editorial revision of the manuscript to improve formatting consistency, terminology, table labelling and the overall presentation.

Comments 2: *Second, while the theoretical framing is clearer than in the original version, the overall theoretical contribution remains somewhat limited and incremental. The study continues to confirm relationships that are largely expected and already well supported in prior literature, namely that fully AI-generated content is perceived as less authentic and trustworthy than human-created content, while AI-assisted content occupies an intermediate position. The revised manuscript improves the articulation of this contribution, but the extent to which it substantially advances signaling theory or the broader literature on AI-mediated communication remains somewhat modest.*

Response 2: *Thank you for this insightful comment. We acknowledge that this study builds on relationships that are partially consistent with previous work on AI-generated content and consumer*

trust. In response, we have further refined the theoretical implications section to highlight more clearly the study's contributions from the perspectives of signalling theory and authenticity-based interpretation. Specifically, we clarified that the study's contribution lies less in demonstrating the expected differences between review scenarios and more in explaining how AI-related signals are interpreted in terms of perceived authenticity to shape consumer trust in the digital marketplace. We have also strengthened the discussion of multi-layered signalling and the role of perceived authenticity as an interpretive mechanism in AI-mediated communication.

Comments 3: *In addition, although the literature review and discussion sections are now more integrated, parts of the manuscript still remain descriptive rather than critically analytical. Greater theoretical synthesis and deeper engagement with alternative interpretations would further strengthen the paper.*

Response 3: *Thank you for this valuable suggestion. In response, we further revised the discussion and theoretical implications sections to strengthen the analytical interpretation of the findings and improve the integration between the literature review and discussion. We also reduced descriptive repetition, clarified the role of perceived authenticity within signaling theory, and incorporated a more cautious discussion of alternative interpretations and study limitations.*

Comments 4: *The issue of measurement reliability also remains relevant. Although the authors have provided additional justification and supplementary indicators, the relatively low Cronbach's alpha reported for the AI-assisted authenticity construct continues to represent a limitation that should be acknowledged cautiously when interpreting the mediation results.*

Response 4: *Thank you for this important comment. We agree that the relatively low Cronbach's alpha for the Perceived Authenticity scale in the AI-assisted condition remains a limitation. We therefore retained a cautious interpretation of the mediation results and explicitly acknowledged that results involving the AI-assisted labeled scenario should be interpreted with caution due to the weaker internal consistency of this measure.*

Comments 5: *Finally, the manuscript would still benefit from additional language polishing and stylistic refinement. While readability has improved, some sections — particularly the practical implications — remain somewhat repetitive and overly extended.*

Response 5: *Thank you for this suggestion. The manuscript has undergone an additional round of language polishing and stylistic revision. In particular, we revised the practical implications and discussion sections to reduce repetition, shorten overly extended passages, improve readability, and strengthen the overall clarity and flow of the manuscript.*