Muhammad Moiz Arif

EV 3.274, 1515 Saint-Catherine Street West

Department of Computer Science and Software Engineering, Concordia University

Montreal, QC, Canada H3G 2W1

April 11, 2017

Dear Editor and Reviewers:

Thank you for your insightful feedback and comments, both positive and constructive, and for allowing us the opportunity to improve our manuscript. We have taken each of your comments into consideration and made the appropriate changes and extensions to our manuscript.

Below, we include a description of the changes that we made to our manuscript with respect to each of the reviewers comments. We denote the reviewers comments in italic typeface, and our responses follow below each reviewer comment.

Reviewer 4 Comments

Comment R4.1. *While the results are interesting, the authors should describe more in depth the implications of their findings for practitioners and researchers analyzing user reviews in mobile applications platforms, i.e why is the consideration of length difference/submission frequency important? what should practitioners and researchers re-consider when automatically processing user reviews in view of the findings presented in this work?*

Response. Thanks for the suggestion. We now elaborate and highlight the implications of our findings in the result section.

Comment R4.2. *Additionally, I would recommend removing the content discussion from the appendix as there is no in depth finding. It is unclear why the authors decided to run LDA on the reviews from all of the applications against the option of running on the reviews of each application separately. I believe that doing so would help to better answer their research question, as the individual topics of each application would be more apparent and avoid the dominance in the topic generation of the applications with most reviews.*

Response. Based on the feedback by both reviewers and due to limited space, we removed the appendix.

Reviewer 3 Comments

Comment R3.3. *According to the authors, the key point is that different app stores need to be considered differently. In my opinion, this is not yet well reflected in the structure and argumentation line of the manuscript.*

Rather, the manuscript has become an even more detailed study about reviews in the Google Play Store. The discussion of the topics, which has been added in this revision, are an example for this direction. Personally, I think that this is not necessarily a bad thing. But it does not really seem to fit the format of a typical

CACM article. E.g., the word count limit does not allow the authors to go into more detail and make more comparisons between the different other studies about app reviews. And yet there is no discussion about more practical implications of the study rather than the point that different stores have different characteristics.

I suggest that the authors take a step back and think again about their goal for this article. Do they want to publish a meta-study or a study of the Google Play Store vs. Apple App Store? Do they maybe need to publish a more in-depth article on the Google Play Store first, without any word count limit, so that they can place an overview over the differences in CACM? Did they maybe try to satisfy all reviewers' comments and lost a bit of the original direction?

Response. Thanks based on the feedback of both reviewers, we removed the appendix. We agree that it is not inline with the paper's main message.

Comment R3.4. *I think the work the authors have done has good potential. If I was the author, I would make two publications out of it. One about the study itself, allowing myself to express the depth of my results, and one meta study in CACM.*

If the authors decide to continue focusing on the difference between their results for the Google Play Store to the Apple App Store, probably the argumentation line, structure, and focus of the current revision have to be adjusted.

Response. Thanks for the suggestion, we rephrase the argumentation line, re-structure the paper in order to fit better with the theme of focusing on the differences between the Google Play Store and the Apple App Store.

Again, we thank all of you for your valuable feedback, which has made this a stronger manuscript. We look forward to hearing your feedback on the updated manuscript.

Sincerely,
Stuart McIlroy, Weiyi Shang, Nasir Ali, Ahmed E. Hassan