Dear Ken,

Jeff will give you more formal feedback, but I wanted to give some comments:

Not a bad analysis, but curious on why you did quantile regression (realized why in results, maybe note data is skewed in methods so that's why quantile regression). May consider a Poisson (log-link) model with an offset for year (I'm still unsure if this is appropriate given the variable of interest is year). Why not have an interaction with an indicator of bareback videos? Then you can compare estimates directly

Figure 1:

Panel A - good figure, but I'd be interested in percentages as well (stacked barcharts). But stacking isn't sufficient on it's own because it doesn't demonstrate rise of # of videos.

Panel B: Put vertical line when Truvada was recommended.

kurtosis misspelled - (kertosis )

Page 3- a bunch of text is emphasized due to some problem with LaTex Rendering (probably missed or mis-aligned $)

Figure 2: why are there

Table 1: Quintile or Quantile for title?

Simple side-by-side boxplots of log10 viewcount for barebackv vs not for each year may help demonstrate your message clearly.

Maybe also look at co-occurence of keywords to get an idea of the accuracy of the labeling of bareback (e.g. did any "solo male" category have this category as well or is it only 1 category per video).

I say submit it, but just review terms of service for Pornhub again just in case.

Analysis 2 Feedback from John: 04.20.2018

Notes:

1. Spelling check
   1. Page 2: methods – linear needs to be correct
   2. Upload year modeled with a spline – as opposed to splined with a cutoff
   3. Results – don’t start sentence off with #: “Of the 1200 etc videos uploaded prior to the cutoff
2. Quantile regression