



Peer Review Report

PEER REVIEW REPORT FOR:

Isabella, G., Melo, A. F., & Gonzalez, M. C. (2023). Going viral on advertising YouTube video: Detecting the influences. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, 27(4), e220300. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-7849rac2023220300.en>

HOW TO CITE THIS PEER REVIEW REPORT:

Rossi, G., Sampaio, D. O., Leite, R., Isabella, G., Melo, A. F., & Gonzalez, M. C. (2023). Peer review report for: Going viral on advertising YouTube video: Detecting the influences. RAC. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8209726>

REVIEWERS:

- George Rossi (Universidade de São Paulo, EACH, Brazil)
- Danilo de Oliveira Sampaio (Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora, Brazil)
- Ramon Leite (Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Minas Gerais, Brazil)

ROUND 1

Reviewer 1 report

Reviewer: George Rossi

Date review returned: December 13, 2022

Recommendation: Major revision

Comments to the authors

It is important to maintain coherence between the title of the work and the objective stated in the abstract, as the variables are different. Viralization is not the same as visualization. The objective stated in the abstract, in fact, presents 02 objectives:

- 1) “...identify which advertising attributes contribute to the display of said ads” and
- 2) ... identify which advertising attributes contribute to the sharing of said ads”

Disclaimer: The content of the Peer Review Report is the full copy of reviewers and authors' reports. Typing and punctuation errors are not edited. Only comments that violate the journal's ethical policies such as derogatory or defamatory comments will be edited (omitted) from the report. In these cases, it will be clearly stated that parts of the report were edited. Check [RAC's policies](#).

Note that the additive particle “and” adds 02 objectives.

Then there is another objective: "In this way, we seek to study the attributes together, which motivate the sharing of video ads using the characteristics present in the videos".

And at the end of the introduction there is another objective: “The purpose of this paper is to understand which characteristics of online ads affect their sharing performance. For that, we seek to answer 1) what are the common characteristics among the best performing videos and 2) what is the importance of each of these characteristics in the performance of an online ad?”

And on p.7, lines 56 to 59, there is another objective different from those mentioned: “The purpose of this paper was to identify which characteristics of ads are responsible for their performance”.

You must specify what the objective is!

In the theoretical approach there is one more variable which is sharing. In this sense, the same variables must be maintained.

Study 1: what kind of qualitative research done?

How was the selection and choice of videos made? P. 8, lines 11 to 18.

Why were the Hellmann's, Itaú and Samsung brands selected?

On p.8, line 59, replace Table 3 with Table 2.

Table2: explain the numbers in the “views” column. Ex.: what do the numbers 12, 782, 278 mean? Explain table 2.

p.10, line 41: “...with similar...to answer the research questions”. Where are these questions?

At the end, present the codes and what type of encoding was done

P.11, l.41 to 42, replace (P1) “performance” with another term as more views

Ditto for “P2”.

p.12, lines 4: P3: confusing, more technical or specific topics, replace the term performance with those presented in the objective

P4, replace the term performance with a more measurable term

P5 ditto, change performance

Same for P6

p.12, lines 47, present the authors of P1, P5 and P6

Propositions 2, 3, 4, and 7 originate from the qualitative

I didn't understand study 2! What kind of conjoint analysis was done?

How the hypothetical combinations of profiles were made

p.13, lines 30 to 34: explain why the Likert scale was used and cite the author.

For the “ratings-based conjoint approach” technique, which uses regression with Likert-type scales for analysis, respondents should be presented with a set of profiles in terms of product, brand or ads.

Study 2 is confused: It needs to present the set of profiles, in short, detail and describe in more depth the elaboration of the profiles and how they are reduced.

The objective presented in the conclusion is different from the one presented

Discussion and conclusion seem to be ok, but for that it is necessary to better describe and specify study 2.

See some papers on conjoint analysis:

Jansen, S. J., Coolen, H. C., & Goetgeluk, R. W. (2011). The measurement and analysis of housing preference and choice (p. 127). Springer Nature.

Rao, V. R. (2014). Applied conjoint analysis (No. 2014). New York: Springer.

Rao, V. R. (2010). Conjoint analysis. Wiley International Encyclopedia of Marketing.

Additional Questions:

Does the manuscript contain new and significant information to justify publication?: Yes

Does the Abstract (Summary) clearly and accurately describe the content of the article?: Yes

Is the problem significant and concisely stated?: No

Are the methods described comprehensively?: No

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?: No

Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?: No

Is the language acceptable?: No

Does the article have data and / or materials that could be made publicly available by the authors?: No

Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state “none” if this is not applicable).: none

Rating:

Interest: 2. Good

Quality: 3. Average

Originality: 2. Good

Overall: 2. Good

Reviewer 2 report

Reviewer: Danilo de Oliveira Sampaio

Date review returned: December 21, 2022

Recommendation: Accept

Comments to the authors

O estudo é condizente com as regras de submissão do periódico. Possui objetivo e metodologia adequadas. Em termos de referencial teórico, é possível tratar uma teoria em específico, detalhar a mesma, e mostrar o porquê da escolha de tal teoria. Como está, fica confuso, pois selecionou-se diferentes autores e teorias, sem apontar a uma em especial.

Sobre a análise dos dados e técnica empregada, a amostra é condizente, mas não esgota outras possibilidades de análises mais pontuais e quantitativas, entretanto, o proposto aponta algumas interessantes descobertas.

Como resultados dos estudos, os mesmos foram bem explicados e detalhados. Recomendações e considerações atendem ao que se espera de um paper de boa qualidade.

Additional Questions:

Does the manuscript contain new and significant information to justify publication?: Yes

Does the Abstract (Summary) clearly and accurately describe the content of the article?: Yes

Is the problem significant and concisely stated?: Yes

Are the methods described comprehensively?: Yes

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?: Yes

Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?: Yes

Is the language acceptable?: Yes

Does the article have data and / or materials that could be made publicly available by the authors?: No

Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state “none” if this is not applicable).:

Nenhum

Rating:

Interest: 2. Good

Quality: 2. Good

Originality: 2. Good

Overall: 2. Good

Reviewer 3 report

Reviewer: Ramon Leite

Date review returned: December 26, 2022

Recommendation: Major revision

Comments to the authors

O artigo aborda uma temática atual e relevante, num momento em que as redes sociais têm assumido um protagonismo nas comunicações de marketing das organizações. Nesse sentido, identificar quais atributos publicitários contribuem para a visualização e compartilhamento dos referidos anúncios se mostra um objetivo importante para a área de marketing.

O artigo demonstra grande esforço ainda ao empreender um estudo multimétodo que contou com duas etapas, sendo uma primeira fase qualitativa e uma segunda quantitativa.

A revisão da literatura abordou temáticas importantes para o estudo, sendo que a Tabela 1 foi uma contribuição interessante deste tópico. No entanto, as temáticas foram abordadas de uma forma mais descritiva, sem uma análise mais densa dos assuntos, talvez pela limitação de espaço.

Os estudos empreendidos demonstram potencial, mas no estudo 1, seria interessante demonstrar se as análises realizadas por um pesquisador foram validadas por outro pesquisador. Seria relevante indicar se os vídeos foram assistidos e descritos por mais de um pesquisador e se as considerações dos diferentes pesquisadores foram congruentes. Em estudos qualitativos dessa envergadura, esse procedimento poderia contribuir para validar os resultados. Para mais informações sobre validade e confiabilidade em estudos qualitativos, vide Scandura e Williams (2000), Godoy (2010) e Paiva, Souza Leão e Mello (2011).

Seria importante ainda indicar quem fez a análise das características (códigos) que foram identificadas nos vídeos. A experiência e formação do pesquisador podem ser aspectos importantes que irão refletir na consistência das análises. A respeito dos procedimentos de análise do primeiro estudo, poderia ainda indicar se foram utilizadas ferramentas de suporte à análise de dados qualitativos.

Vale a pena ainda mencionar porque os vídeos daquelas empresas foram selecionados, ou seja, porque analisar vídeos de empresas tão diferentes, como Itaú, Hellman's e Samsung. Quais os critérios para chegar a essas empresas. O argumento utilizado (The intention was to minimize bias and compare characteristics of ads in different markets) parece frágil e pouco embasado.

No estudo 2 há também alguns pontos a serem questionados, principalmente o fato de apresentar o conteúdo para os indivíduos pesquisados de uma forma diferente da original. Embora seja louvável o esforço do(s) autor(es) em relatar esse procedimento e assumir essa limitação do estudo, na prática essa discrepância contamina os resultados de tal estudo e fragiliza de forma significativa o estudo.

Com relação ao estudo 2, seria importante ainda indicar qual era a população da pesquisa e como os indivíduos foram selecionados, assim como quando ocorreu a pesquisa. Poderia ainda descrever o perfil da amostra.

Sente-se falta ainda de uma análise mais aprofundada dos resultados do estudo 2, à luz de outros estudos relacionados.

Ao final do trabalho, parece haver uma preocupação maior em demonstrar as limitações do estudo do que de fato indicar as contribuições do mesmo. Dessa forma, a conclusão se mostra simplista.

Por fim, há referências em padrões distintos. Além disso, há obras citadas que não constam na lista de referências (ex. Pinto, Almeida & Gonçalves, 2013).

Referências

Scandura, T. A., & Williams, E. A. (2000). Research methodology in management: Current practices, trends, and implications for future research. *Academy of Management journal*, 43(6), 1248-1264.

Godoy, A. S. (2005). Refletindo sobre critérios de qualidade da pesquisa qualitativa. *Gestão. org*, 3(2), 80-89.

Paiva Júnior, F. G., de Souza Leão, A. L. M., & de Mello, S. C. B. (2011). Validade e confiabilidade na pesquisa qualitativa em administração. *Revista de Ciências da Administração*, 13(31), 190-209.

Additional Questions:

Does the manuscript contain new and significant information to justify publication?: Yes

Does the Abstract (Summary) clearly and accurately describe the content of the article?: Yes

Is the problem significant and concisely stated?: No

Are the methods described comprehensively?: No

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?: No

Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?: Yes

Is the language acceptable?: Yes

Does the article have data and / or materials that could be made publicly available by the authors?: Yes

Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state "none" if this is not applicable).: Nenhum

Rating:

Interest: 2. Good

Quality: 3. Average

Originality: 3. Average

Overall: 3. Average

Authors' Responses

March, 03rd 2023

Professor Dr. Marcelo Bispo

Editor-in-Chief, Revista de Administração Contemporânea

Dear Professor Dr. Marcelo Bispo,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit our paper to RAC and for the valuable feedback provided by the reviewers. Their contribution was crucial in improving the quality of our article.

We are pleased to submit this new-round draft, which we believe addresses the reviewer's concerns and suggestions. We have made significant changes to the paper, particularly in terms of adding the suggested tables, developing the paper's impact for RAC readers, and linking our research to the ONU-ODS.

In the sections following this letter, we provide detailed responses to the comments offered by the Associate Editor and the three reviewers. We have also highlighted the key revisions we have made in response to each suggestion.

We hope that these changes demonstrate our commitment to meeting the high standards of RAC and look forward to hearing your feedback.

Sincerely,

The authors

Detailed Responses to the Comments Offered

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

We would like to express our gratitude for your belief in the potential contributions of our paper to the field of business. We have carefully considered all your comments and suggestions, and we are pleased to submit the revised version of the paper. We believe that the improvements we have made have resulted in a more comprehensive and insightful work, and we hope that you find them satisfactory. Once again, thank you for your guidance and support.

AE Comment:

1) RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

In addition, create research questions. See Table 1, for example Moorman and Day (2016) Organizing for marketing excellence. Journal of Marketing, November, Vol. 80.

Create a table according to Moorman

Answer: Thank you for sharing the idea of using the table from Moorman and Day (2016). We believe that this has significantly improved the presentation of our research question and gap. Your suggestion was invaluable, and we are grateful for your input. We added this table on the introduction of our paper.

AE Comment:

2) PREVIOUS LITERATURE

- The author does not present a table analyzing previous literature (Herzberg's two-factor theory). It could be use to show significant gaps for research. A table could summarize the previous result and positioning the paper. See table 1 and table 2 (summary of findings) in Kumar and Reinartz (2016) creating enduring customer value Journal of Marketing, November, Vol. 80.

- Create a table according to Kumar and Reinartz

Answer: Thank you for sharing the idea of using the Kumar and Reinartz tables to present the GAP. After reading the Moorman and Day table, we realized that adding one more table for the GAP might be too much. So, to avoid repetition, we decided to only include the Moonman table. We believe that the GAP is now much clearer, but please let us know if it's not. Instead of adding a new table, we improved Table 2 by including more and new references.

AE Comment:

3) RAC GUIDE <https://rac.anpad.org.br/index.php/rac/about>. RAC seeks to promote communication between governmental, business and industrial, academic and non-governmental organizations, which are fundamental in solving problems related to societal problems involving management, with a regional emphasis on global articulation. It also seeks to advance interdisciplinary research of social relevance on contemporary issues such as applied technologies, climate change, biodiversity, environmental pollution and waste, renewable and non-renewable natural resources, diversity, inequality, poverty, the labor market, and sustainability. Create a new paragraph showing the implications of your paper to the RAC guidelines OR Create a (1 or 2) new paragraph showing the implications of your paper in terms of congruence with RAC focus OR Create a new paragraph showing the association of your paper findings to the ONU-ODS guidelines.

Answer: Thank you for providing clear guidance on what was expected to be added to the paper. Your guidance in bringing the guidelines from RAC to the text was greatly appreciated. We have incorporated a new paragraph into the conclusions to address this topic, specifically adding the text "Considering the development perspectives of scientific research, this work contributes to the field by exploring the understanding of the functioning and appeal of digital media in the context of conversion of online tools and consumer behavior in the context of the web. It is also understood that, from a managerial point of view, it was possible to broaden the understanding of the appeal of different approaches in video campaigns on the YouTube social network, thus expanding the view on the tools increasingly used by managers in their strategic context."

REVIEWER 1

Recommendation: Major Revision

We would like to express our gratitude for your confidence in the potential contributions of our paper to RAC. We also appreciate your keen eye in identifying discrepancies within the same paper. All of your suggestions were carefully considered, as you will see in our comments and the revised version of the paper below. Once again, thank you for your valuable time and support.

R1 Comment: It is important to maintain coherence between the title of the work and the objective stated in the abstract, as the variables are different. Viralization is not the same as visualization. The objective stated in the abstract, in fact, presents 02 objectives: 1) "...identify which advertising attributes contribute to the display of said ads" and 2) ... identify which advertising attributes contribute to the sharing of said ads". Then there is another objective: "In this way, we seek to study the attributes together, which motivate the sharing of video ads using the characteristics present in the videos". And at the end of the introduction there is another objective: "The purpose of this paper is to understand which characteristics of online ads affect their sharing performance. For that, we seek to answer 1) what are the common characteristics among the best performing videos and 2) what is the importance of each of these characteristics in the performance of an online ad? And on p.7, lines 56 to 59, there is another objective different from those mentioned: "The purpose of this paper was to identify which characteristics of ads are responsible for their performance". You must specify what the objective is!

Answer: We apologize for the lack of consistency and coherence in describing the objective of our paper. We understand that clarity in stating the objective is critical in any research work. Thank you for bringing these inconsistencies to our attention. We have replaced all references to the objective with the one used in the abstract, which reads, "Our goal is to identify the advertising contributions that impact the viewing and sharing of ads."

R1 Comment: In the theoretical approach there is one more variable which is sharing. In this sense, the same variables must be maintained.

Answer: Thank you for your comment. We standardized the construct in the paper to ensure consistency. Please note that there are two different performance measurements: the number of people who saw the video (study 1) and the intention to share the video with others (study 2). That is why we used the word "performance," but we understand that it was too broad. Being specific is important, so we adjusted the text accordingly.

R1 Comment: Study 1: what kind of qualitative research done?

Answer: Thank you for your question. For the qualitative analysis, we used the Template Analysis theory. We have now added this information to the paper as well.

R1 Comment: How was the selection and choice of videos made? P. 8, lines 11 to 18.

Answer: Thank you for your question. After selecting the brands, we chose all videos that were between 15 seconds and 1 minute in length. The reason for this time cut is due to the limitations of social networks, as most platforms (such as Facebook and Instagram) do not allow videos longer than one minute to be uploaded. As this is a qualitative research study involving different execution criteria, videos less than 15 seconds would be insufficient for data collection. We did not select videos that were not within this range. Another criterion we used was the date of publication. We chose campaigns that were published up to three years ago. For the analysis of proprietary media (Colicev et al. 2018), we only selected contents posted on the brand's YouTube channel. We did not consider campaigns on other profiles or other communication vehicles. We chose YouTube as the channel because it has assumed a leading role in the dissemination of organic and advertising content, facilitating the sharing and production of various materials. Lastly, the content itself was also a criterion for selection. Some videos are part of a series, which is a sequence of videos with similar formats and characteristics for promoting the same product. In this case, we stipulated a maximum of two advertisements per series - the first two - in order to analyze heterogeneous content with different characteristics. We understand that the selection process of videos was not clear, so we have revised the text in the paper to provide more clarity.

R1 Comment: Why were the Hellmann's, Itáu and Samsung brands selected?

On p.8, line 59, replace Table 3 with Table 2.

Answer: Thank you for your question. We understand that the brand's selection was not completely clear on the paper, so we have revised the text to provide more clarity. We explained that the first study aimed to identify common characteristics among the most viewed videos. A total of 35 videos were selected. In choosing the videos, we aimed to generalize across different industries, specifically financial services, food products, and technology products and services. The main objective was to minimize biases and compare ad characteristics in different markets, considering their specificities. We chose the following brands: Itáu (financial sector), Samsung (technology), and Hellmann's (food industry) because they are among the largest in their sectors and have a wide range of brand awareness and digital dissemination.

R1 Comment: Table2: explain the numbers in the "views" column. Ex.: what do the numbers 12, 782, 278 mean? Explain table 2.

Answer: Thank you for your comment. We meant thousands. We have made a correction and added a subtitle to ensure better understanding.

R1 Comment: p.10, line 41: "...with similar....to answer the research questions". Where are these questions?

Answer: Thank you for your comment. The research questions considered in this study are as follows: 1) What are the common characteristics among the most successful videos? and 2) What is the importance of each of these characteristics in the performance of an online ad? (see page 2, line 59, and page 3, lines 5-6). We classify the videos through coding, where content with similar characteristics is grouped to attempt to answer the research questions as proposed in the main objective (Silverman, 2013).

R1 Comment: At the end, present the codes and what type of encoding was done.

Answer: The codes were presented in page 10, line 51.

We also added that during the analysis, new characteristics proved to be relevant, as they frequently appeared in the videos collected, which enabled the creation of new analysis codes: presence or absence of real people; the veracity of the stories; the moment when the brand is mentioned in the ad; the way it appears in the ad; and verbal conjugation, that is, how the character interacts with the user. By counting the frequency with the characteristics (codes) that appeared in each of the ads, it was possible to associate which characteristics seem to have the greatest impact on the performance of the ad. In this study, performance consists of the number of views of the ads.

It is worth mentioning that the analysis was carried out individually by two authors, and subsequently, a check was carried out, with one author having performed and the other validated. In addition, two specialists in the field of digital marketing validated the codes.

R1 Comment:

P11, l .41 to 42, replace (P1) "performance" with another term as more views

Ditto for "P2".

p.12, lines 4: P3: confusing, more technical or specific topics, replace the term performance with those presented in the objective

P4, replace the term performance with a more measurable term

P5 ditto, change performance

Same for P6

Answer: Thank you for your comment. As commented above, we standardized the construct in the paper to ensure consistency. We made this change in all the propositions and text.

R1 Comment:

p.12, lines 47, present the authors of P1, P5 and P6

Propositions 2, 3, 4, and 7 originate from the qualitative

Answer: Note that Propositions 1, 5, and 6 were derived from the data analysis and are also supported by the literature. For example, Woodside (2010) supports Proposition 1, while Proposition 5 is supported by Berger & Milkman (2012), Nelson-Field et al. (2013), and Belanche et al. (2017). Tucker (2015) supports Proposition 6. In some way, these propositions have already been tested in previous studies through YouTube ads and other types of content, such as journalistic articles. Propositions 2, 3, 4, 7, and 8 complement the existing literature by introducing new aspects to the discussion.

R1 Comment:

I didn't understand study 2! What kind of conjoint analysis was done?

Answer: Conjoint analysis is a statistical technique used to determine how people value different features or attributes of a product or service. We used the Full-profile conjoint analysis: This type of analysis presents respondents with several product profiles that include different levels of multiple attributes. Our respondents then rate each profile, and the analysis determines the relative importance of each attribute.

R1 Comment:

How the hypothetical combinations of profiles were made.

Answer: In conjoint analysis, an orthogonal bundle refers to a set of attributes and levels that have been carefully selected and combined in a way that minimizes overlap and allows for the independent estimation of the relative importance of each attribute. We created an orthogonal bundle using the marketing engineering from excel add in, based in all the relevant attributes that came out from the study one. In the appendix A we add all the scripted tested.

The system used ensure that the profiles are orthogonal, the levels of each attribute are systematically varied across the different

profiles. This means that each attribute is represented equally across all profiles and that no two profiles are identical.

R1 Comment:

p.13, lines 30 to 34: explain why the Likert scale was used and cite the author.

For the “ratings-based conjoint approach” technique, which uses regression with Likert-type scales for analysis, respondents should be presented with a set of profiles in terms of product, brand or ads.

Answer: Since we used full-profile conjoint analysis, it is common to ask people about their intention to purchase rather than asking them to choose between two or three options. We understood that asking participants to choose between ad-framings (videos) would have made the study too long. However, to clarify our decision in the paper, we added the following explanation - "We chose to use a Likert scale to measure behavior, as it is considered one of the best scales for this purpose (Jebb et al., 2021)."

R1 Comment:

Study 2 is confused: It needs to present the set of profiles, in short, detail and describe in more depth the elaboration of the profiles and how they are reduced.

Answer: Thank you for your comment. If it was not clear to you, it might not have been clear to other readers as well. As a result, we have rewritten this section to provide a clearer explanation of how the orthogonal bundles were created and how they relate to the frame-ads.

R1 Comment:

The objective presented in the conclusion is different from the one presented.

Answer: Thank you for your comment. Such an objective mix should not have occurred, and we appreciate you bringing it to our attention. We have replaced the objective mentioned in the conclusion with the one stated in the abstract, which is to identify which advertising contributes to the viewing and sharing of said ads.

R1 Comment:

Discussion and conclusion seem to be ok, but for that it is necessary to better describe and specify study 2.

Answer: Thank you for bringing this to our attention. We have made the necessary changes to the text to clarify it.

R1 Comment:

See some papers on conjoint analysis:

Jansen, S. J., Coolen, H. C., & Goetgeluk, R. W. (2011). The measurement and analysis of housing preference and choice (p. 127). Springer Nature.

Rao, V. R. (2014). Applied conjoint analysis (No. 2014). New York: Springer.

Rao, V. R. (2010). Conjoint analysis. Wiley International Encyclopedia of Marketing.

Answer: Thank you for bringing a paper and some books to our knowledge. We really appreciate it.

REVIEWER 2

Recommendation: Accept

Gostaríamos de expressar nossa mais sincera gratidão por terem aceitado nosso artigo no RAC nesta rodada. Também agradecemos seus comentários e feedbacks. Foram valiosos para nós. Sua avaliação minuciosa de nosso artigo e críticas construtivas contribuíram significativamente para melhorar a qualidade e clareza de nossa pesquisa, como você verá a seguir. Estamos agradecidos por seu tempo e esforço em revisar nosso artigo.

R2 Comment:

O estudo é condizente com as regras de submissão do periódico. Possui objetivo e metodologia adequadas.

Answer: Gostaríamos de agradecer pelas suas palavras de incentivo e pelo seu parecer positivo em relação ao nosso trabalho. Ficamos contentes em saber que o nosso artigo agradou o revisor e atendeu às expectativas da revista.

R2 Comment:

Em termos de referencial teórico, é possível tratar uma teoria em específico, detalhar a mesma, e mostrar o porquê da escolha de tal teoria. Como está, fica confuso, pois selecionou-se diferentes autores e teorias, sem apontar a uma em especial.

Answer: Agradecemos pelo seu comentário. O primeiro revisor também ressaltou a necessidade de melhorias no referencial teórico. Com o objetivo de aprimorá-lo, realizamos mudanças nos textos, incluímos e alteramos autores, além de construirmos tabelas mais completas.

R2 Comment:

Sobre a análise dos dados e técnica empregada, a amostra é condizente, mas não esgota outras possibilidades de análises mais pontuais e quantitativas, entretanto, o proposto aponta algumas interessantes descobertas.

Answer: Obrigado pelo comentário, de fato outras análises poderiam ser realizadas. Optamos pelo simples, pois respondia o nosso propósito de trabalho. Obrigado.

R2 Comment:

Como resultados dos estudos, os mesmos foram bem explicados e detalhados. Recomendações e considerações atendem ao que se espera de um paper de boa qualidade.

Answer: Estamos muito gratos pelo seu tempo e dedicação em avaliar nosso trabalho. Mais uma vez, muito obrigado pelo seu feedback e contribuição para o sucesso do nosso artigo.

REVIEWER 3

Recommendation: Major Revision

Gostaríamos de expressar nossa gratidão por aceitar mais uma rodada de revisão do nosso artigo na revista RAC. Agradecemos pela oportunidade para melhorar e aprimorar o nosso estudo. Reconhecemos a importância do seu papel como revisor em nos orientar e oferecer feedbacks valiosos, que contribuem significativamente para a qualidade do nosso trabalho. Mais uma vez, agradecemos pela sua dedicação em nos ajudar a atingir as expectativas da RAC.

R3 Comment:

O artigo aborda uma temática atual e relevante, num momento em que as redes sociais têm assumido um protagonismo nas comunicações de marketing das organizações. Nesse sentido, identificar quais atributos publicitários contribuem para a visualização e compartilhamento dos referidos anúncios se mostra um objetivo importante para a área de marketing.

O artigo demonstra grande esforço ainda ao empreender um estudo multimétodo que contou com duas etapas, sendo uma primeira fase qualitativa e uma segunda quantitativa.

Answer: Obrigada pelas palavras de incentivos, somos muito gratos por saber que tomamos uma decisão acertada na escolha do tema e dos métodos.

R3 Comment:

A revisão da literatura abordou temáticas importantes para o estudo, sendo que a Tabela 1 foi uma contribuição interessante deste tópico. No entanto, as temáticas foram abordadas de uma forma mais descritiva, sem uma análise mais densa dos assuntos, talvez pela limitação de espaço. Os estudos empreendidos demonstram potencial, mas no estudo 1, seria interessante demonstrar se as análises realizadas por um pesquisador foram validadas por outro pesquisador.

Answer: Obrigada pelo pertinente comentário. A análise foi realizada de forma individual por 2 dos autores do artigo e posteriormente, um cruzamento das informações foi feito. Um autor fez e o outro validou. Quanto aos códigos, dois especialistas do tema de marketing digital validaram os códigos. Concordamos que essa informação é relevante e por isso incluímos o texto a seguir no artigo " It is worth mentioning that the analysis was carried out individually by two authors, and subsequently, a check was carried out, with one author having performed and the other validated. In addition, two specialists in the field of digital marketing validated the codes."

R3 Comment:

Seria relevante indicar se os vídeos foram assistidos e descritos por mais de um pesquisador e se as considerações dos diferentes

pesquisadores foram congruentes. Em estudos qualitativos dessa envergadura, esse procedimento poderia contribuir para validar os resultados. Para mais informações sobre validade e confiabilidade em estudos qualitativos, vide Scandura e Williams (2000), Godoy (2010) e Paiva, Souza Leão e Mello (2011).

Answer: Agradecemos pelo excelente comentário e referências. Compreendemos a sua preocupação em relação à transcrição dos vídeos realizada por apenas um dos autores e a possibilidade de informações relevantes terem sido omitidas. Diante disso, optamos por revisitar os vídeos analisados e verificar se faltaram descrições importantes que deveriam ser mencionadas. Para garantir a imparcialidade do processo, o pesquisador responsável pela transcrição inicial não participou dessa verificação, somente os outros autores do paper o fizeram. Como resultado, embora algumas descrições tenham sido adicionadas ao documento de transcrição dos vídeos, o resultado da análise e das proposições criadas não foram alterados.

R3 Comment:

Seria importante ainda indicar quem fez a análise das características (códigos) que foram identificadas nos vídeos. A experiência e formação do pesquisador podem ser aspectos importantes que irão refletir na consistência das análises.

Answer: Obrigada pelo pertinente comentário. A análise foi realizada de forma individual por 2 dos autores do artigo e posteriormente, um cruzamento das informações foi feito. Um autor fez e o outro validou. Quanto aos códigos, dois especialistas do tema de marketing digital validaram os códigos.

R3 Comment:

A respeito dos procedimentos de análise do primeiro estudo, poderia ainda indicar se foram utilizadas ferramentas de suporte à análise de dados qualitativos.

Answer: De fato a utilização de softwares como NVivo entre outros é muito comum na análise de dados textual. Entretanto, optamos por realizar a análise de template manualmente. Não foram utilizadas ferramentas de suporte no estudo 1. Esta informação foi adicionada no texto para trazer mais clareza sobre este ponto. Incluímos a frase "To this end, two studies were conducted: a qualitative analysis, which sought to identify and measure the characteristics present in the ads through template analysis theory, followed by a quantitative survey using the conjoint analysis method."

R3 Comment:

Vale a pena ainda mencionar porque os vídeos daquelas empresas foram selecionados, ou seja, porque analisar vídeos de empresas tão diferentes, como Itaú, Hellman's e Samsung. Quais os critérios para chegar a essas empresas. O argumento utilizado (The intention was to minimize bias and compare characteristics of ads in different markets) parece frágil e pouco embasado.

Answer: Agradecemos imensamente pelo valioso feedback recebido. Percebemos que essa também foi uma preocupação levantada pelo revisor 1. Nossa intenção ao generalizar as empresas em diferentes setores (financeiro/serviços, alimentação/produtos, tecnologia/produtos e serviços) foi justamente evitar qualquer tipo de viés de conhecimento, considerando possíveis impactos de receitas do mercado, contexto atual das empresas e do governo, entre outros fatores que poderiam interferir no conhecimento das marcas e produtos. Para reforçar essa escolha, complementamos a descrição do método do estudo 2 com mais argumentos. Esperamos ter esclarecido quaisquer dúvidas e agradecemos novamente pelo valioso retorno.

R3 Comment:

No estudo 2 há também alguns pontos a serem questionados, principalmente o fato de apresentar o conteúdo para os indivíduos pesquisados de uma forma diferente da original.

Embora seja louvável o esforço do(s) autor(es) em relatar esse procedimento e assumir essa limitação do estudo, na prática essa discrepância contamina os resultados de tal estudo e fragiliza de forma significativa o estudo.

Answer: De fato, essa foi uma limitação que tivemos que assumir no artigo. Houve diversos motivos para essa escolha, como os custos envolvidos na produção de vídeos de alta qualidade que pudessem fornecer as informações que desejávamos (teríamos que padronizar os vídeos de tal forma que não houvesse outras variáveis exógenas ao modelo), além da realidade das agências de propaganda. Como a produção de vídeos é cara, as agências utilizam templates (como nós fizemos) para uma análise inicial e, posteriormente, com a decisão final, produzem apenas um vídeo. Entendemos que esse resultado pode ser diferente e, por isso, colocamos essa limitação. De qualquer forma, optamos por esclarecer melhor a decisão tomada no texto para que o leitor tenha maior transparência em relação à nossa tomada de decisão.

R3 Comment:

Com relação ao estudo 2, seria importante ainda indicar qual era a população da pesquisa e como os indivíduos foram selecionados, assim como quando ocorreu a pesquisa. Poderia ainda descrever o perfil da amostra.

Answer: Obrigado por trazer esse ponto. Essa informação de fato é importante, incluímos a descrição das amostras dos dois pre testes e do estudo quantitativo que estava faltando.

R3 Comment:

Sente-se falta ainda de uma análise mais aprofundada dos resultados do estudo 2, à luz de outros estudos relacionados.

Answer: Obrigada por trazer essa questão da necessidade de aprofundamento das análises. De fato optamos por trabalhar com regressão simples, já que essa técnica respondia ao nosso problema de pesquisa. Mas, com o objetivo de clarear a informação ao leitor, realizamos ajustes na descrição das análises realizadas.

R3 Comment:

Ao final do trabalho, parece haver uma preocupação maior em demonstrar as limitações do estudo do que de fato indicar as contribuições do mesmo. Dessa forma, a conclusão se mostra simplista.

Answer: Excelente ponto, um artigo bem citado é aquele que traz contribuição para a ciência. Obrigado por trazer esse ponto. Alteramos no texto e melhoramos o mesmo incluindo novas perspectiva de pesquisas futuras.

R3 Comment:

Por fim, há referências em padrões distintos. Além disso, há obras citadas que não constam na lista de referências (ex. Pinto, Almeida & Gonçalves, 2013).

Referências

Scandura, T. A., & Williams, E. A. (2000). Research methodology in management: Current practices, trends, and implications for future research. *Academy of Management journal*, 43(6), 1248-1264.

Godoy, A. S. (2005). Refletindo sobre critérios de qualidade da pesquisa qualitativa. *Gestão. org*, 3(2), 80-89.

Paiva Júnior, F. G., de Souza Leão, A. L. M., & de Mello, S. C. B. (2011). Validade e confiabilidade na pesquisa qualitativa em administração. *Revista de Ciências da Administração*, 13(31), 190-209.

Answer: Pedimos desculpas por esse deslize. De fato esse tipo de erro não pode ser cometido. Obrigado pelo comentário. Ajustamos a formatação das referências para APA e revisamos se todos os artigos foram citados. Mais uma vez, obrigado pelo seu tempo e pelo valioso feedback ao artigo. Ficamos na torcida para ter respondido e atendido todas as suas exigências.

ROUND 2

Reviewer 1 report

Reviewer: George Rossi

Date review returned: March 20, 2023

Recommendation: Major revision

Comments to the authors

Dear authors, the article is interesting and it can be seen that they are improving the article more and more. However, regarding the rigours of a research, more detailing of the methodological procedures is important, in particular, the conjoint analysis. In this sense, I suggest that you detail the entire procedure of the joint analysis. See Hair et al. (2009) *Análise multivariada de dados*, chap. 07, or other literature. Also, specify what kind of qualitative research was carried out and present all its methodological rigor. A strong point was the validation of the codes by two other researchers. But, specify the sample for this qualitative. On p.32 and 35 there is a description of the conjoint analysis, I think it would be more interesting to put all this together. on p. 32 there is the X2 test, explain how and why this test was done it is confusing.

Additional Questions:

Does the manuscript contain new and significant information to justify publication?: Yes

Does the Abstract (Summary) clearly and accurately describe the content of the article?: Yes

Is the problem significant and concisely stated?: Yes

Are the methods described comprehensively?: No

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?: No

Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?: Yes

Is the language acceptable?: Yes

Does the article have data and / or materials that could be made publicly available by the authors?: No

Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state “none” if this is not applicable).: None

Rating:

Interest: 1. Excellent

Quality: 3. Average

Originality: 2. Good

Overall: 2. Good

Reviewer 2 report

Reviewer: Danilo de Oliveira Sampaio

Date review returned: April 18, 2023

Recommendation: Accept

Comments to the authors

The requested revisions were fulfilled and the article is better written and with more important details about the text, theory and data analysis. It is understood that the authors inserted details and content necessary to meet the demands of the opinion.

Additional Questions:

Does the manuscript contain new and significant information to justify publication?: Yes

Does the Abstract (Summary) clearly and accurately describe the content of the article?: Yes

Is the problem significant and concisely stated?:

Are the methods described comprehensively?: Yes

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?: No

Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?: Yes

Is the language acceptable?: Yes

Does the article have data and / or materials that could be made publicly available by the authors?: No

Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state “none” if this is not applicable).:

Rating:

Interest: 2. Good

Quality: 1. Excellent

Originality: 2. Good

Overall: 1. Excellent

Reviewer 3 report

Reviewer: Ramon Leite

Date review returned: April 19, 2023

Recommendation: Accept

Comments to the authors

Parabéns ao(s) autor(es)! As mudanças realizadas foram pertinentes e contribuíram de forma significativa para a melhoria do trabalho.

Constata-se que a tabela 1 enriqueceu a Introdução do estudo. A Revisão da Literatura também ganhou densidade e melhor direcionamento.

O conteúdo das proposições também ficou mais apropriado, e a nova versão do artigo deixou mais clara a metodologia utilizada.

Já na Conclusão é onde se percebe a maior evolução entre as versões do artigo, o que trouxe mais riqueza ao trabalho, de uma forma geral.

Obrigado por poder revisar novamente o artigo e constatar que as recomendações foram atendidas, além de aprimorar o trabalho, de maneira geral.

Additional Questions:

Does the manuscript contain new and significant information to justify publication?: Yes

Does the Abstract (Summary) clearly and accurately describe the content of the article?: Yes

Is the problem significant and concisely stated?: Yes

Are the methods described comprehensively?: Yes

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?: Yes

Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?: Yes

Is the language acceptable?: Yes

Does the article have data and / or materials that could be made publicly available by the authors?: Yes

Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state "none" if this is not applicable).: Nenhum

Rating:

Interest: 2. Good

Quality: 2. Good

Originality: 2. Good

Overall: 2. Good

Authors' Responses

June, 23rd 2023

Professor Dr. Marcelo Bispo

Editor-in-Chief, Revista de Administração Contemporânea

Dear Professor Dr. Marcelo Bispo,

Thank you for the opportunity to resubmit our paper to RAC and for the feedback provided by you and the reviewers. We followed all the suggestions, and we hope to reach the high standards of RAC in this new version.

We are pleased to submit this new-round draft. We have made significant changes to the paper, particularly in terms of adding the suggested table, linking our research to the ONU-ODS and rewriting the conclusion of the paper.

In the sections following this letter, we provide detailed responses to the comments offered by the Associate Editor and the reviewers.

We look forward to hearing your feedback.

Sincerely,

The authors

Detailed Responses to the Comments Offered

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

We would like to express our gratitude for your belief in the potential contributions of our paper to the field of business. We have carefully considered all your comments and suggestions, and we are pleased to submit the revised version of the paper.

AE Comment:

1) Although reviewers and the associate editor recognized the improvement of the paper regarding its specific content, the manuscript still lack adequacy to RAC's focus and scope. Only state in the end of the paper that it has possible relation with SDG 9 and 12 does not offer the discussion required to reflect on how your study real addresses the points raised by SDG on innovation and consumption. The critical debate on goals 9 and 12 must be considered over the whole text. To accept your article this point is required.

Answer: Thank you for your valuable feedback. We have made significant revisions to address your concern regarding the adequacy of our paper to RAC's focus and scope, particularly in relation to SDG 9 (Sustainable Industry, Innovation, and Infrastructure) and SDG 12 (Responsible Consumption and Production). To ensure comprehensive coverage, we have incorporated information about SDG 9 and 12 in the abstract, introduction, theoretical background, and conclusion. These additions highlight the alignment of our study with the goals and emphasize our contributions to sustainable industry, innovation, and responsible consumption and production.

AE Comment:

2) MODEL in the END of ALL PROPOSITIONS

creates a model in the end of all propositions, do it in a qualitative way for improving theory (see similar models from Daiane Scaraboto papers)

Answer: Thank you for your suggestion to include a qualitative model at the end of all propositions in our manuscript. Inspired by Daiane Scaraboto's papers, we incorporated the table 5 that summarizes the key findings and propositions of our study. These additions strengthen the finding of our first study.

AE Comment:

3) between p2 and p3 you missed paragraphs, arguments and citations. do it for each proposition

Answer: We greatly appreciate your feedback regarding the development of propositions in our manuscript. In response to your comment, we have included paragraphs, arguments, and citations between each proposition, as you suggested. To enhance the rigor of our propositions, we have incorporated arguments from the relevant literature to support each statement cited below as have utilized data from our own study 1 to strengthen the development of our propositions. This inclusion of our own data further enhances the validity and credibility of the propositions.

References added to the paper:

Alsina, E. F., Rand, W. and Lerman, K. (2015). The success of question answering communities: How diversity influences ad hoc groups, *Collective Intelligence*, 1–4.

Ertimur, B., & Gilly, M. C. (2012). So whaddya think? Consumers create ads and other consumers critique them. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 26(3), 115-130. doi: 10.1016/j.intmar.2011.10.002

Fritz, K., Schoenmueller, V., & Bruhn, M. (2017). Authenticity in branding—exploring antecedents and consequences of brand authenticity. *European Journal of Marketing*, 51(2), 324-348. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-10-2014-0633>

Truong, Y., McColl, R., & Kitchen, P. (2010). Practitioners' perceptions of advertising strategies for digital media. *International Journal of Advertising*, 29(5), 709-725. <https://doi.org/10.2501/S0265048710201439>

AE Comment:

4) c) conclusion is very poor, and you used short paragraphs. Exclude all conclusion and started from zero. Creates 5 big paragraphs for conclusions, 1=study 1, 2=study 2, 3 theory on general, 4 etc. and 5 etc.

Answer: Thank you for your feedback on the conclusion section of our manuscript. We have taken your comments into consideration and rewrote the conclusion to enhance its quality. In the revised conclusion, the first and the second paragraph provides a comprehensive summary of the main findings and results of both Study 1 and Study 2. Then we focused on the broader implications and significance of our findings. We discussed the practical applications or recommendations based on the results, emphasizing their relevance for practitioners and decision-makers. Furthermore, we emphasize the overall significance and contribution of our study to the field. Finally, we conclude the paper by suggesting avenues for future research and addressing the limitations of our study.

REVIEWER 1

Recommendation: Major Revision

We would like to express our gratitude for your confidence in the potential contributions of our paper to RAC. All of your suggestions were carefully considered, as you will see in our comments and the revised version of the paper below.

R1 Comment: Dear authors, the article is interesting and it can be seen that they are improving the article more and more. However, regarding the rigours of a research, more detailing of the methodological procedures is important, in particular, the conjoint analysis. In this sense, I suggest that you detail the entire procedure of the joint analysis. See Hair et al. (2009) *Análise multivariada de dados*, chap. 07, or other literature.

Answer: We are grateful for your positive feedback on our article and your observation that we have been continually improving it. Recognizing the importance of methodological rigor, we have taken your suggestion to heart and dedicated significant effort to provide a more detailed account of the conjoint analysis procedure in our methodology section. In doing so, we have sought guidance from reputable sources, including Hair et al.'s (2009). We changed the order of some paragraph as added new information. We have also introduced a dedicated table that provides an overview of the levels and attributes used in the conjoint analysis, facilitating a clearer understanding of our analysis design. In addition to enhance the overall structure and flow of the paper, we have separated the data collection procedure as a distinct section within the methodology. We hope we have achieved a more coherent and ordered presentation of the conjoint analysis, enhancing its clarity and detail within our research.

R1 Comment: Also, specify what kind of qualitative research was carried out and present all its methodological rigor. A strong point was the validation of the codes by two other researchers. But, specify the sample for this qualitative.

Answer: Thank you for your feedback. We have made substantial improvements to the qualitative research methodology section in response to your comments. We have provided a clear description of the specific qualitative research approach used and added extra information to clarify the sample for the qualitative component. We appreciate your valuable input and kindly request reconsideration of our manuscript for acceptance.

R1 Comment: On p.32 and 35 there is a description of the conjoint analysis, I think it would be more interesting to put all this together. on p. 32 there is the X2 test, explain how and why this test was done it is confusing.

Answer: Thank you for your feedback. However, I would like to clarify that the page numbers you mentioned (32 and 35) do not correspond to the content of our manuscript. Maybe it was just a typo problem, so, we decided to carefully review the relevant sections related to the conjoint analysis in our paper. In response to it, we found opportunities to restructure the presentation by consolidating and organizing the information more effectively. Your commented helped us to improve this part of the paper. Thank you a lot.

REVIEWER 2

Recommendation: Accept

We would like to express our deepest gratitude for accepting our article in RAC this round. We also appreciate your comments and feedback. They have been invaluable to us.

R2 Comment:

The requested revisions were fulfilled, and the article is better written and with more important details about the text, theory and data analysis. It is understood that the authors inserted details and content necessary to meet the demands of the opinion.

Answer: We would like to thank you for your words of encouragement and your positive assessment of our work. We are delighted to know that our article pleased the reviewer and met the expectations of the journal.

REVIEWER 3

Recommendation: Accept

Gostaríamos de expressar nossa gratidão pelo seu tempo e feedbacks anteriores. Ficamos contentes que em saber que agradamos ao revisor e alcançamos o alto nível da RAC.

R3 Comment:

Parabéns ao(s) autor(es)! As mudanças realizadas foram pertinentes e contribuíram de forma significativa para a melhoria do trabalho.

Constata-se que a tabela 1 enriqueceu a Introdução do estudo. A Revisão da Literatura também ganhou densidade e melhor direcionamento.

O conteúdo das proposições também ficou mais apropriado, e a nova versão do artigo deixou mais clara a metodologia utilizada.

Já na Conclusão é onde se percebe a maior evolução entre as versões do artigo, o que trouxe mais riqueza ao trabalho, de uma forma geral.

Obrigado por poder revisar novamente o artigo e constatar que as recomendações foram atendidas, além de aprimorar o trabalho, de maneira geral.

Answer: Agradecemos imensamente pelo seu comentário sobre o artigo. Ficamos felizes em saber que as mudanças realizadas foram pertinentes e contribuíram para a melhoria do trabalho. Somos gratos também por ter revisado novamente o artigo e constatado que as recomendações foram atendidas.