X videos and Y comments were included in the analysis. Among these, Z (z%) were from Publisher A, Z were from Publisher B (…). [Then, move on to the **NEW R1.** See next page.]

H1a proposed that [paraphrase H1a]. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to test the effect of platform on trendiness. The main effect was not significant; *F*(2, 123) =.06, *p* = .95. The pairwise comparison (Table X) did not reveal any statistically significant differences between videos on TikTok (*m* = , *s*d = ), YouTube(*m* = , *s*d = ), and Instagram(*m* = , *s*d = ). Therefore, H1a was not supported.

H1b and H1c proposed [paraphrase H1a]. A one-way ANOVA revealed that there is no significant difference in terms of trendiness between different [MediaType]s; *F*(2, 123) =.06, *p* = .95. Statistically significant difference in trendiness was not observed between TikTok (*m* = , *s*d = ), YouTube(*m* = , *s*d = ), and Instagram(*m* = , *s*d = ). Therefore, H1b and H1c were not supported.

H2 predicted that [paraphrase H2]. There was a significant correlation between the sentiment in comments and the trendiness of the presentations, although the relationship was relatively weak; *r*(977) = -.16, *p* < .01. H2 was supported.

H3 predicted that [paraphrase H3]. The trendiness of the video and the number of comments were not significantly correlated; *r*(126) = .16, *p* = .08. H3 was not supported.

H4 predicted that [paraphrase H4]. The one-way ANOVA revealed the effect of platform on comment sentiment is significant *F*(2, 976) =5.36, *p* < .01. H4a was supported. The pairwise comparison (Table X) showed that the difference between TikTok (m = , sd = ) and Instagram (m = , sd = ) is significant; ; *t*(761.73) = -3.07, *p* < .01. H4b was supported. However, the difference between TikTok and YouTube, or Instagram and YouTube (m = , sd = ), was not statistically significant. Therefore, H4c and H4d were not supported.

**New RQ1**

***RQ1****. What are the characteristics of the videos from different ~~platforms and~~ publishers?*

Content analysis studies usually focus a lot on reporting descriptive statistics (how much of what exists where; similar to demographic information). You will have RQ1 for that.

1. Include the ANOVA table (platform and publisher; they have their own folders), Pairwise Comparison tables, and M/SD tables in the manuscript.
2. Report the means and standard deviations that are theoretically meaningful (i.e., you intend to report the meaning of the difference – we will discuss this) AND significantly different between conditions.
   1. Variables that are related to the hypotheses or can potentially explain the hypotheses that were rejected (not supported) are theoretically meaningful.
   2. A significant ANOVA result should have a p-value below .05, and the pairwise comparison’s p-value (p-corr) should also be <.05.
3. Variables not discussed at all should be removed from the manuscript.

Tables

* RQ2 and so forth for each hypothesis
  + M SD table: IV M SD
  + ANOVA table: not needed
  + Pairwise Comparison Pairwise t-test
    - A, B becomes IV1 and IV2
    - T
    - Dof becomes df
    - P-corr as *p*\*
      * Note. \*Bonferroni correction
* H2 H3 no table
* RQ1: Publishers and DVs (NOT Platforms)
  + ANOVA table
    - Variables as DV
    - Ddof (df) 1 and 2
    - F
    - P
  + Pairwise
    - A, B becomes IV1 and IV2
    - T
    - Dof becomes df
    - P-corr as p\*
    - Note. \*Bonferroni correction
  + M/SD: Everything