Hi Dale,

(Pls let me know if you want me to refer to you by a different name. I'm going with email signature, but let me know if you'd prefer something different)

Thanks for sending this - it's really interesting.  Among other things, who would've thought "Twink" peaked in 2013!

And apologies if this isn't the best thought through set of comments you've ever gotten - I just got back from two and a half months straight work travel, so I'm a bit scattered. (It all felt a little "movie/Audra version of The Glamorous Life" by the end)

Also - I'm not sure what this was prepared for, so just take all comments as the howls into the contextless void that they are.

My favourite thing about your analysis is that it's so far away from what I would've done.  My default toolbox for looking at whether an intervention in mid-2014 changed behaviour would've probably been something like a logistic regression where I'd try to predict if a video was bareback or not based on the covariates you have.  I'd probably add the view count (or its log) as a covariate as well.

Based on your analysis, that would've been a bad model. You don't really talk about it in your text but the idea that the structure of viewership for popular vids is different to that of less popular ones is implicit in your analysis.  You never really justify why you're doing quantile regression, but it's clearly the correct tool here (I mean, you talk about the skeweness in the key predictor, but I'd say the stronger argument is that viewing of niece SEM is expected to be somewhat more stable over time. What will change is "what is niche".).

I'm personally not super-invested in p-values (basically, if you provide a tool that will give an unequivocal yes/no answer regardless of the quality of the data, you've provided the wrong tool), but I think your interpretation of all of the things you've reported are correct. (Yes - statisticians are the sort of people who like finding fault with things we basically like.)

"For example, the CDC decision could have occurred after a growing popularity of unprotected anal intercourse in PornHub consumer’s preferences." Givenyou have the data, you could probably check this. Although it doesn't ring directly true. There are sexual practice surveys that might indicate barebacking was on the up before the PrEP recommendations, but I've not noticed it (although I've yet to live in the US, so who knows if I would've).

Did you experiment with truncating at various points before 2014 to see if barebacking was on the decline?

Outside of what you did, I'm curious about the effect of PrEP on strategic positioning.  It seems straightforward to me that if someone was on PrEP and bottoming, they'd likely be more willing to engage in risky sex practices than a bottom who was not on PrEP, but I've not seen research in that direction. You talk a little about this in your last paragraph, but it's a super interesting topic.  (I'm obviously going to spend the weekend reading all your linked refs - I'm about 5 years out of date on my knowledge of this stuff and it's been an important 5 years!)

(Minor things: You should use \log when referring to a logarithm in a latex math environment. And it all got a bit exciting between $ signs on page 3..)

Basically, I really like your analysis.  And I hope you make this data public at some point. I really want to try stuff with this data at some point - it seems rich and interesting.

I'm happy to talk about anything - and again sorry if anything above doesn't make sense.  It's been a long few months!

And please, if you keep going along these lines please keep me informed - it's not my main area, but I find it super interesting. And if you need a stats reader for anything, just email.

Best wishes,

Dan