

Abstract

Community-driven online question and answer forums (CQA) contain an expansive amount of crowd-sourced knowledge. Thousands of questions and answers are posted everyday. One such example of a CQA is iFixit’s *Answers* forum. This forum features user-asked questions related specifically to device repair, which are answered by both repair experts and everyday users. A reliable measure of the health of these CQAs is question response time. Fast response times enhance user engagement and satisfaction, and increase web traffic. This paper presents a survival analysis of response time, or the time until a question receives its first answer. A Cox proportional hazards model was developed to predict the survival probability of a question, or the probability that a question receives an answer before a certain time. Though several predictors were significant, the model’s predictive accuracy was low ($R^2 = 0.15$). Significant predictors were the device category of the question (questions pertaining to Apple products received answers faster than others (HR = 2.56, 95% CI = (2.31, 2.82))) and factors related to the question’s title (e.g., whether or not it was phrased as a question (HR = 1.31, 95% CI = (1.22, 1.41))). Future studies can investigate if factors identified as significant in this analysis can be generalized to other CQAs.

Introduction

Community-driven online question and answer forums (CQA) are becoming widely-used sources of information. These online platforms feature thousands of user-posted questions and answers, and can receive millions of visits every month. The CQA analyzed in this paper is iFixit’s *Answers* forum. Founded in 2003, iFixit’s mission is to equip users with the knowledge and tools to repair their broken devices, as part of an effort to save money and reduce electronic waste. This company provides over 30,000 free online repair guides and sells the specialized tools and parts needed for such repairs.

As not all possible repairs are covered in the published guides and users may have additional questions related to existing guides, iFixit’s *Answers* forum is another important resource. This platform features questions pertaining to over 9,000 devices, ranging from jammed zippers to shattered iPhone screens and faulty vehicle air conditioners, with over 100,000 solutions. As thousands of users rely on this forum for information, it is important that users receive timely answers. Fast response times enhance user experience and increase web traffic, which is valuable to the reputation and longevity of the *Answers* forum. Analysis of response times can reveal factors that affect how quickly questions receive answers, which can lead to suggestions for how users can ask better questions to minimize response times, and for how the forum design can be improved.

However, analysis and prediction of response times on CQAs have not been thoroughly investigated. There is need for further analysis of response times in these forums, as the majority of existing research focuses on assessing and

predicting question and answer quality. This paper presents a survival analysis on the time until a question receives its first answer on iFixit’s *Answers* forum, in order to determine factors significantly related to answer time and to predict the “survival” probability of a question.

Related Work

With the recent increase in the popularity and use of CQAs, these platforms have been the subject of a multitude of studies related to information sciences. Regarding analysis of response times, [?] developed a classification model to estimate response times for questions posted on *Stack Overflow*, using both tag-based and textual features. Analysis determine that tag-based features, like the number of “popular” tags a question contains or the number of users subscribed to a tag, were the best predictors of response time. [?] proposed models based on exponential distributions to predict response times, and were built from users’ previous wait times for responses. [?] analyzed response times and satisfaction rates for questions posted on *Yahoo Answers!*, and determined that the fastest times were between users who did not follow each other, while the longest times were between users who were mutual friends in the social network. [?] developed a taxonomy for classifying unanswered questions on *Stack Overflow*, and developed a model to predict how long a question would remain unanswered using textual features like title and post length and whether or not the question contained code, and user features, like the number of questions asked and answered by the user prior to posting. The analysis presented in this paper seeks to analyze response time through survival analysis methods, methods that have not yet been investigated or applied to CQAs.

The majority of existing research has been focused on predicting question and answer quality by using both textual and non-textual features of posts. [?] developed a classification algorithm to assess the quality of posts on *Nabble.com*, using primarily textual features (surface, lexical, syntactic, forum-specific, and similarity (relatedness of a post to the topic of the forum) features). [?] also determined that textual features, i.e word count, was the most accurate metric of Wikipedia article quality. Wikipedia articles can represent the same kind of user-generated content featured on CQAs. On the other hand, [?] found that non-textual features, like revision and comment count on an answer or the number of points or merit badges a user has, were the most useful indicators of answer quality across four different knowledge domains on *Stack Exchange*. A number of other studies have also developed classification algorithms using both textual and non-textual features with the similar goal of predicting question and answer quality [?] [?] [?]. [?] presented a slightly different approach by analyzing the content of posts and utilizing latent topic models to predict quality. [?] developed models to the long term value of a question and its answers on *Stack Overflow*. The present analysis combines both textual and non-textual features of questions on iFixit’s *Answers* forum in a Cox regression model to predict survival probability of questions.

Materials

Day of the week the question was posted
Device category the question pertains to. Categories include: AndroidOther Phone, Apple Products, Camera, Electronics, Game Console, Home, Other, PC, Tablet, Vehicle
Whether or not the question’s text contains any end punctuation marks (. ? !)
Whether or not the question’s text is in all lower case
Whether or not the question’s title contains at least one word that is considered “frequently used” among answered questions. See appendix for a complete list of these terms.
Whether or not the question’s title contains at least one word that is considered “frequently used” among unanswered question. See appendix for a complete list of these terms.
Whether or not the question’s title ends in a question mark
Whether or not the user edited or added information to the question’s text sometime after posting it
Whether or not the user made an effort to solve the problem prior to asking the question

Table 1: Categorical predictors derived

Average number of characters in each question’s tags
Average tag “score” for all of a question’s tags. A tag score is defined as the proportion of times a tag appears in all of the data. Questions without tags were assigned a score of 0.
Number of characters in the question’s text
Number of characters in the user-defined device name
Ratio of the number of line breaks to the number of characters in the question’s text

Table 2: Continuous predictors derived

The data analyzed contained 8,025 questions posted from April 8, 2017 (10:14 PM) to July 7, 2017 (9:28 PM) (the date the data was downloaded). Variables in the data included: device name and category, title, text, tags, whether or not the user was a member of iFixit’s site for less than one day before the question was posted, date and time when the question was posted, and date and time when the first answer was received. Variables derived can be found in Table 1 and 2. See appendix for information on how predictors were created.

Methods

Questions analyzed were restricted to those posted in English. The time until event variable used in survival analysis was defined as the time since posting until a question received its first answer. For questions that did not receive an answer by the download date, time until event values were defined as the time since posting to the time the data was downloaded. Such questions were considered right-censored, meaning that exact answer times for these questions are greater than the times in the data (questions can still receive answers after the download date) [?].

Survival was defined as the event that a question did not receive an answer beyond a certain time, t . Estimates of survival probability were generated with the Kaplan-Meier method, which adjusts to the presence of right-censored, or unanswered questions [?]. From these estimates, survival curves were constructed to examine the survival experience of questions. Mean, median and other percentiles of survival times were also generated.

As the probability distribution for response times is unknown, a nonparametric Cox proportional hazards model was developed to predict the survival probability of questions [?]. To build the model, five-fold cross-validation was used [?]. Univariate analysis, performed on one training set, was used to identify variables to include in the final predictive Cox model [?]. Each predictor was entered into univariate Cox models, and strength of association with response times was assessed. Those with partial likelihood ratio test p-values of less than 0.001 were included in the final model. Continuous predictors were entered into univariate Cox models both with and without square root and log transformations to determine the form of the predictor to include into the final model. Univariate analysis was again performed on each continuous predictor to investigate the use of splines. Each predictor, with the transformation found necessary in the previous analysis, was fit to three separate Cox models with restricted cubic splines of three, four, and five knots. AIC statistics were used to determine whether or not to include splines, as well as the optimum number of knots [?]. All predictors found to be significant, along with the transformations and functional forms found to be necessary, were included in the model for cross-validation. No variable selection was used, as [?] determined that reducing the number of predictors in the model decreased predictive accuracy more so than leaving all predictors in.

In each fold of cross-validation, the full model was built on the training set and used to generate predicted hazard ratios on the corresponding test set. To assess prediction performance, predicted hazard ratios were entered into separate Cox models as the single quantitative predictor with response times as the survival time. The resulting Nagelkerke's R-square statistic, concordance statistic, Somers' Dxy, partial likelihood ratio and p-value, were assessed as indicators of the model's performance [?]. Significant results from this model would indicate high predictive accuracy. The partial likelihood ratio assessed is a ratio of the log partial likelihood function evaluated at the parameter estimates, equivalent to a goodness of fit measure of the model with all predictors, and the log

partial likelihood function for the null model with no predictors and only the baseline hazard function, equivalent to a goodness of fit measure for the null model. The p-value for this statistic was calculated from the χ^2 distribution [?]. Concordance statistics and Somers' Dxy are a measure of the model's discriminative ability. Concordance is defined as the probability that for any two randomly chosen questions, the question with the shorter response time also has the higher predicted hazard ratio. Concordance statistics close to 1 indicate high discriminative ability, while statistics close to 0.5 indicate discordance, or random predictions. Somers' Dxy is the difference between the model's concordance statistic and discordance, 0.5. A Somers' Dxy statistic of 0 indicates random predictions, while a statistic equal to 1 indicates perfect predictions [?]. These metrics were computed for each iteration on every training and test set. Averages of metrics across training and test sets were evaluated. The final model was then fit to the full data and the same metrics were computed and compared.

Correlations between scaled Schoenfeld residuals, differences between observed and expected predictor values for questions that received answers, and a function of time, were examined to assess the proportional hazards assumption that the effect of predictors on hazard does not depend on time [?]. Significant correlations would indicate that a predictor has violated this assumption.

To obtain predicted survival probabilities using the model, the predict-SurvProb function was used from the pec package. This function uses the Cox model and a vector of times to compute predicted survival probabilities.

Results and Discussion




Figure 1: Distribution of response times




Figure 2: Kaplan-Meier curve for all questions

Of 8,025 questions in the full data set, 7760 were in English (97% of the full data). Of those questions, 4951 (63.8%) received an answer by the download date. The shortest response time was 0.5 hours. The longest was 2159.02 hours (89.96 days). Figure 1 shows the distribution of response times for all questions analyzed.

Percent Answered	Time (hrs)
25	0.88
50	9.16
55	18.38
58	33.71
60	59.47
64	683.19

Table 3: Kaplan-Meier estimated quantiles of survival time

Figure 2 shows the Kaplan-Meier estimated survival probability for all questions in the data. The curve indicates that if a question does not receive an answer within the first 100 hours after it has been posted, the likelihood of it receiving an answer in the future is low. The Kaplan-Meier estimated mean survival time, or the average time until a question received its first answer was 775.75 hours, or 32.32 days. The median survival time, the time at which 50% of the questions in the data received an answer, was 9.16 hours. Table 3 provides additional percentiles of survival time.

Each training set contained 6208 questions, and each test set contained 1552 questions. Results of univariate analysis, performed on one training set, for transformed and untransformed continuous predictors, and every categorical

Table 4: Univariate analysis results for continuous predictors, ordered by increasing p-values

Predictor	p-value
*Log transformation of the number of characters in a question’s text	0.00
*Square root transformation of the number of characters in a question’s text	1.1102e-16
Number of characters in a question’s text (untransformed)	6.9472e-12
*Square root transformation of the ratio of the number of line breaks to the number of characters in a question’s text	1.1488e-11
*Square root transformation of the average frequency “score” of a question’s tags	1.4642e-11
Average frequency “score” of a question’s tags (untransformed)	1.2706e-08
Ratio of the number of line breaks to the number of characters in a question’s text (untransformed)	1.3988e-7
*Square root transformation of the number of characters in the user-defined device title	2.2914e-4
*Square root transformation of the average number of characters in a question’s tags	2.9999e-4
Number of characters in the user-defined device title (untransformed)	6.5304e-3
Average number of characters in a question’s tags (untransformed)	2.6115e-2

Table 5: Univariate analysis results for categorical predictors, ordered by increasing p-values

Predictor	p-value
Day of the week the question was posted	7.8677e-4
Device category	0.00
Whether or not the question’s text contained at least one end punctuation mark	2.5354e-9
Whether or not the question’s text is in all lower case	1.5400e-7
Whether or not the question’s title contains terms considered to be frequently used among answered questions	7.6397e-5
Whether or not the question’s title contains terms considered to be frequently used among unanswered questions	0.00
Whether or not the question’s title ended in a questionmark	1.1423e-12
Whether or not the user edited or added information to the question’s text sometime after posting it	2.5472e-7
Whether or not the user had been a member for less than one day before the question was posted	0.00
Whether or not the user made an effort to solve the problem on their own, prior to asking the question	3.1648e-5

Table 6: Univariate analysis results for continuous predictors, ordered by increasing p-values

Predictor	Transformation	p-value
Average number of characters in each questions tags	Untransformed	2.6115e-2
	Log	NA
	Square root	2.9999e-4
Average frequency score of a question’s tags	Untransformed	1.2706e-08
	Log	NA
	Square root	1.4642e-11
Number of characters in a question’s text	Untransformed	6.9472e-12
	Log	0.00
	Square root	1.1102e-16
Number of characters in the user-defined device title	Untransformed	6.5304e-3
	Log	NA
	Square root	2.2914e-4
Ratio of the number of line breaks to the number of characters in a question’s text	Untransformed	1.3988e-7
	Log	NA
	Square root	1.1488e-11

predictor, are shown in Table 6 and Table 5, respectively. All categorical predictors and all continuous predictors marked with an asterisk (*) were entered into the full model.

Table 7 shows the results of determining the optimal number of knots for each continuous predictor. Values of knots marked with an asterisk (*) were included in the final model.

Average performance metrics for test and training sets and in Table 8. Partial likelihood ratio statistics and p-values indicate that the model as a whole is significantly associated with response time. However, its R^2 statistic and discrimination indexes are considerably

Assessing the proportional hazards assumption indicated that several predictors were in violation, results can be found in Table ?? . Final model statistics and parameter coefficients are in Table 10. Metrics for the final model’s performance on the full data are found in 9, and are consistent with the metrics found in cross validation—the model as a whole is significantly associated with response time, but has a low R^2 statistic and indicates low discriminative ability. Individual predictors found to be significant ($\alpha = 0.001$) are: device category, whether or not the question’s text contains “frequently-used” terms among unanswered questions, whether or not the questions title ends in a questionmark, whether or not the user updated the question after posting it.

The data analyzed for this model presented limitations, and may explain the model’s low predictive accuracy. Many users on the CQA incorrectly specified the device name in their question (e.g. “Turtle Beach Ear Force Xmy grandson chewed through the wire while he was playing it’s brand-new is there anyway I can have it fixed0 One”), or did not include a device name at all. Many users also incorrectly used the tagging system by including ambiguous and lengthy

Table 7: Determining the optimal k number of splines for each predictor

Predictor	K	AIC
Log transformation of the number of characters in a question's text	0	65862.83
	5*	65862.02
	4	65863.35
	3	65862.08
Square root transformation of the ratio of the number of line breaks to the number of characters in a question's text	0	65890.28
	5	65884.70
	4	65882.98
	3*	65881.93
Square root transformation of the average frequency "score" of a question's tags	0*	65890.75
	5	65891.69
	4	65891.75
	3	65892.35
Square root transformation of the number of characters in the user-defined device title	0	65922.76
	5*	65853.56
	4	65882.07
	3	65881.39
Square root transformation of the average number of characters in a question's tags	0	65923.26
	5	65912.11
	4*	65910.10
	3	65912.38

Table 8: Average performance metrics for training and test sets

	HR	LR	pval	R2	Dxy	Concordance
Training Sets	2.0164	937.2018	0.0000	0.1401	0.2693	0.6346
Test Sets	1.9761	220.0417	0.0000	0.1401	0.2584	0.6292

Table 9: Performance metrics for model fit to the full data

HR	LR	pval	R2	Dxy	Concordance
2.0010	1192.3234	0.0000	0.1424	0.2698	0.6349

Table 10: Coefficients for predictors in the final model

Variable	Levels	Hazard Ratios	p-value
Device Category	Apple Product	0.93	<0.0001
	Camera	-0.26	
	Electronics	-0.08	
	Game Console	0.21	
	Home	0.39	
	Other	-0.11	
	PC	0.43	
	Tablet	-0.15	
	Vehicle	0.38	
	Whether or not the user had been a member for less than one day before the question was posted	-0.10	0.0048
	Whether or not the question's title contains terms considered to be frequently used among unanswered questions	-0.27	<0.0001
	Whether or not the question's title contains terms considered to be frequently used among answered questions	0.05	0.2235
	Whether or not the question's title ended in a questionmark	0.25	<0.0001
	Whether or not the question's text contained at least one end punctuation mark	0.03	0.5348
	Whether or not the question's text is in all lower case	-0.18	0.0052
	Whether or not the user edited or added information to the question's text some-time after posting it	0.28	0.0009
	Whether or not the user made an effort to solve the problem on their own, prior to asking the question	-0.09	0.0137
Day of the Week	Monday	0.01	0.0004
	Saturday	-0.07	
	Sunday	-0.11	
	Thursday	0.03	
	Tuesday	0.09	
	Wednesday	0.10	
	Square root transformation of the average frequency "score" of a question's tags	2.23	0.0020
Square root transformation of the average frequency of tags	avg_tag_length'	-0.08	0.0457
	avg_tag_length"	0.58	Nonlinear
Log transformation of the number of characters in the question	text length	-1.52	0.0804
	text length	-0.08	0.4344
	characters in text_length"	Nonlinear	
Square root transformation of the number of characters in the question	text_length"	2.39	0.4578
	text_length"	-3.69	
	text_length"		
Square root transformation of the number of characters in the question	device length	-0.07	0.2790
	device_length'	0.18	Nonlinear
	device_length"	-0.27	0.4185
	device_length"	0.21	
Square root transformation of the number of characters in the question	online break	0.12	0.3569
	online break	0.36	Nonlinear

tags like “someone sat on it :(” or “help me please!!!!”(tags are generally a couple key words that describe the topic of the question). These inconsistencies in the data presented some difficulties in analysis, and may explain the model’s low R^2 and discrimination indexes.

Future studies can further investigate if the predictors found to be significant in this study can be generalized to other CQAs.

Conclusion

This study developed a Cox proportional hazards model to predict the probability that a question posted on iFixit’s *Answers* forum receives an answer before a certain time. Predictors found to be significant in the model included: device category, whether or not the question contained words considered to be “frequently-used” among unanswered questions, whether or not the title ends in a questionmark, and whether or not the user updated the question’s text after the initial posting. While overall the model was significant, its predictive performance was considerably low.

Acknowledgement

This research is supported by the Bill and Linda Frost fund.

Appendix

Device	Title	Text	User	Date Posted
iPhone 6	iPhone water damage, touch screen issue	So I dropped my iPhone in water 4 days ago. Have done the whole rice thing and seen huge difference in it. However, only one side of my screen works and it is the one side which I need to unlock the phone. What would be the best way forward?	1	2017-05-10 21:50:48 C

Table 11: Example of an answered question

Device	Title	Text	User	Date Posted
android tablet	ccccaaaan you help me fix my touch screen	touch screen not worki	0	2017-05-23 07:35:12 C

Table 12: Example of an unanswered question

Device category

- Original device categories, defined by iFixit, included: Apparel, Appliance, Camera, Car and Truck, Computer Hardware, Electronics, Game Console, Household, Mac, Media Player, PC, Phone, Skills, Tablet, Vehicle. Device titles were parsed and certain categories were combined or separated to create a new device categorization. Categories in the final variable included: Android/Other Phone, Apple Product, Camera, Electronics, Game Console, Home, Other, PC, Tablet, Vehicle. Under original device categorization, 1,954 questions (25.2% of 7,760) were not categorized correctly and indicated an NA for its category. Missing values were a result of users creating questions for devices not already in the iFixit’s database, or from the user incorrectly defining the device name. For questions with missing categories, key words were searched for in device titles to recategorize accordingly.

Whether or not the question’s title contains terms considered to be frequently used among answered/unanswered questions

- Logical variables indicating true if a question’s title contained at least one of the words in the “frequently-used” words list for answered and unanswered questions, respectively.
- These variables were created based on the hypothesis that certain question topics are more popular among the answering community, and that questions concerning these topics might receive an answer faster than questions that do not. Similarly, certain topics might be unpopular, and questions pertaining to those topics might receive answers slower than those that do not (cite).
- To create the variables, the data was separated between answered and unanswered questions. For the data frame containing answered questions, text mining techniques were used to create a list of every word within each questions’ titles and the frequency, or proportion of times those words occurred among all answered questions’ titles. The same was performed for the data frame containing unanswered questions. “Frequently-used” words in answered questions were defined as those that appeared in more than 1% of all answered questions’ titles, and appeared in more answered questions than in unanswered questions. To determine the latter, a ratio of frequencies, or proportions of times a word occurs, was assessed. The ratio was calculated as the proportion of time a word occurred among answered questions, to the proportion of times a word occurred in unanswered questions. As an example, if “cracked” appeared in 2% of answered questions and 0.1% of unanswered questions, it would be considered “frequently-used” among answered questions as it occurs in more than 1% of answered questions’ titles and occurs 20 times more in answered question than in unanswered questions ($\text{ratio} = 0.02/0.001 = 20$). Similarly, “frequently-used” words in unanswered questions must occur in 1% or more of all unanswered question’s titles and occur in more unanswered questions than

answered questions. As there was some overlap between “frequently-used” words in each list and the device categories, every word that matched a device name was removed from the lists. The resulting list for answered questions contained 111 words. The list for unanswered questions contained 32 words. Lists can be found in Table 13

Table 13: Lists of “frequently-used” terms among answered and unanswered questions’ titles, ordered by decreasing frequency

“Frequently-used” terms among answered questions	screen, turn, working, replacement, power, work, replace, charging, charge, button, touch, black, turning, broken, start, stuck, new, lcd, upgrade, problem, change, port, replaced, card, open, boot, replacing, remove, reset, back, drive, error, cable, ssd, cracked, hard, one, dropped, logic, lines, white, keeps, pro, dead, now, front, damage, switch, parts, glass, still, charger, issue, sim, turns, digitizer, just, mode, model, backlight, usb, stopped, logo, starting, know, unresponsive, password, factory, call, use, damaged, find, sensor, possible, fixed, side, galaxy, data, ipod, problems, issue, slow, system, connector, without, overheating, code, ram, air, microphone, please, red, much, plugged, getting, booting, left, way, buy, plus, time, loose, lock, coming, got, shuts, says, install, key, door, top
“Frequently-used” terms among unanswered questions	sound, light, wifi, speaker, connect, picture, stay, noise, bluetooth, isnt, apps, going, rear, question, play, stop, service, take, hear, lights, showing, network, volume, come, keep, connection, flashing, shut, print, blue, buttons, edit

Whether or not the question’s title ended in a questionmark

- This variable was created based on the hypothesis that questions with titles in the form of questions receive answers faster than those that do not.

Whether or not the question’s text contained at least one end punctuation mark

- This variable was created to investigate if run-on sentences, sentences with no end punctuation, take longer to receive an answer.

Whether or not the user made an effort to solve the problem on their own, prior to asking the question

- Logical variable indicating true if the asker included words in the question’s text that indicate prior effort or research was done before asking the question (e.g. “tried”, “attempted”, “tested”). This variable was created based off of findings from [?].

Average frequency “score” of a question’s tags

- This variable was created to investigate the idea that some tags are more “popular”, or widely used than other tags, and that including such tags might increase the likelihood of that question receiving an answer faster. This variable is the average frequency, or proportion of times a question’s tags appear in all of the data set. If a question has a higher average, than at least one of it’s tags are frequently used. This variable was created based off of findings from [?].

Number of characters in the user-defined device title

- This variable was included to capture when a user incorrectly defines the device name. For example, the device variable for question 390271 is, “Turtle Beach Ear Force Xmy grandson chewed through the wire while we was playing it’s brand-new is there anyway I can have it fixed”, and is 136 characters long. 11 questions in the data also did not include any device title. This variable was created based on the intuition that users who incorrectly define their devices, or do not include any device title, make it difficult for the answering community to discern the question’s topic, and thus have longer answer times or remain unanswered.

Average number of characters in a question’s tags

- This variable, similar to the device-length variable, was created to capture when a user correctly or incorrectly used the tagging system. For example, question 390989 included the tag “i need to repair the headset because i can not find the bluetooth”, which is 64 characters. Question 410254 includes tags “sound”, “sound driver” and “speaker” and has an average of 8 characters per tag. It is hypothesized that users who correctly define tags, as with the latter user, receive answers quicker than the former.

Ratio of the number of line breaks to the number of characters in a question’s text

- This variable was based on the hypothesis that question’s that include line breaks in the text are generally easier to read than questions that don’t include any, and thus have faster answer times.