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Q2: No external funding was received.

Q3: Confirmed

Q4: Confirmed

Q5: Confirmed

Q6: Confirmed

Q7: Confirmed

**Q8: Equations**

Q9: Confirmed

Q10: Updates: The following are vectors:

(a) Equation 2: beta (**β**) should be in bold

(b) Equation 6: theta (**θ**) should be in bold

(c) Equation 7: theta (**θ**) and \hat{\theta} should be in bold

**Q11: Need to read text “because” and “whereas” / “although”**

Q12: These do not need to be capitalized. Please feel free to convert to lower case “ego-based” and “alter-based” as required.

Q13: EV is “Extreme Value”

Q14: Yes, Twitter is OK.

Q15: The source is the Cai et al (2015) paper cited earlier in the sentence.

Q16: Conference Proceedings: Editors, Publisher, Location of Publisher, Page Range.

Conference Proceedings:

(a) Domingos P, Richardson M (2001) Mining the network value of customers. Proceedings of the seventh ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining, 57–66.

Editors: Foster Provost and Srikant Ramakrishnan

Publisher: Association for Computing Machinery

Location of Publisher: New York, NY

Page Range: 57-66

(b) Eckles D, Esfandiari H, Mossel E, Rahimian MA (2019) Seeding with costly network information. Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation, 421–422.

Editors: Anna Karlin, Nicole Immorlica, and Ramesh Johari

Publisher: Association for Computing Machinery

Location of Publisher: New York, NY

Page Range: 421-422

(c) David Kempe, Jon Kleinberg, Éva Tardos (2003) Maximizing the spread of influence through a social network.

Editors: Lise Getoor, Ted Senator, Pedro Domingos, and Christos Faloutsos

Publisher: Association for Computing Machinery

Location of Publisher: New York, NY

Page Range: 137-146

(d) Wilder et al, Influence Maximization with Unknown Network Structure

Editor: Sheila A. McIlraith and Kilian Q. Weinberger

Publisher: Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence

Location: Washington, DC

Page Range: 77-77

Q17: King and Summers , Volume and Issue

7 (1)

Volume 7, Issue 1.

Q18: See response to Q16 (d)

**Q19: Check Tables and Figures**

Q20:

Table 3: Model element in Column; Model in row

Table 9: Strategy (both row and column)

Q21:

References can be deleted.

Q22: Yes, this is ok.

Changes: I would appreciate if you could change the following to make the text of the paper especially the introduction consistent.

(a) Abstract has numbers **14**%-30%, could you please change to **13**%-30%.

(b) (Page 2, top of column 2) Could you please add “the” (bolded)

The friendship paradox thus suggests potential strategies for sampling higher degree individuals (those with more friends) in any network, without knowing **the** network structure.

(c) (Page 3, Column 2, near Q12) Could you please change Kumar et al (2024) to be (Kumar et al 2024) with parentheses across the full citation?

(d) (Page 3, Column 2, Section 1.4 “Findings”)

Could you please alter the paragraph as below?

**Current:**

We find that higher degree nodes are less likely to communicate WOM among adopters, but there is no such difference for nonadopters.

**Updated:**

We find that higher degree nodes are less likely to communicate WOM among adopters and nonadopters. However, despite this negative correlation between degree and WOM,

(e) (Page 3, Column 2, Section 1.4 “Findings”) Please delete “**among adopters”** in the sentence below.

“However, despite this negative correlation between degree and WOM **among adopters**”

**Updated 1.4 Findings Paragraph**

We find that higher degree nodes are less likely to communicate WOM among adopters and nonadopters. However, despite this negative correlation between degree and WOM, we estimate that the friendship paradox (ego-based) local friend strategy provides a substantial improvement over the random strategy. It also improves effectiveness over a leader seeding strategy used by the firm. When the local friend strategy is used in conjunction with the leader strategy, the hybrid provides a further marginal improvement. We find that informationally more demanding strategies like top degree and top diffusion perform better than other strategies, obtaining a much higher improvement, but needing more information. Finally, we find that when the proportion of seeds is lower, the relative effectiveness of the local friend strategy is greater.

Section 2. Data. (Page 4, Column 2) Repetitive sentence. Please remove “Opinion leaders have a much higher degree than average”

Retain (34% more) and merge with previous sentence.

Section 3. Model and Estimation

(Page 5 column 1)

Replace “WOM effort” by “WOM propensity” to update the following sentence:

“First, we allow the WOM probability from a node to differ by degree, reflecting the idea that WOM **propensity** may depend on this factor.

(Page 5, Column 2): Replace “friends” by “neighbors” and “friend” by “neighbor” – Updated sentence below:

“We model these events as being independent draws across the set of **network** **neighbors** of a household. Households become fully informed following a WOM communication received from any **neighbor**.”

Section 4 Results (Page 7, Column 2)

LOTS TO INSERT HERE

Section 5. Counterfactuals

(Page 8, Column 2) Within the Friend category, we examine the impact of the local friend strategy, which samples on **neighbors** of randomly chosen network nodes to obtain seeds.

(Page 9, Column 1)

Add to first paragraph (about Line 3),

“The difference between them is whether the resulting seed obtain must be a leader (strong) or not (weak).”