Response to referee 1

Thank you for your comments!

- I think there is too much space devoted to the question of why the paper was chosen. Too much on citations of this paper vs. others in the genre. Also, I suspect the reason why this paper has received more citations is because Hal Varian was on the paper, and he is quite famous. This is more likely than his google affiliation. (Also, may be an accurate signal of the paper’s quality, although I haven’t read the papers in question.)

I will shorten this discussion in the revised version

- There are some issues with grammar and punctuation. E.g., “(2010)’s conclude”.

The revised version will be sent to a professional proof-reader

- The formatting in the table could and should be improved. More importantly, the table should include many more notes so that a reader can understand it without reference to the text. Which is the key variable/search terms?

I will improve the formatting of the table as suggested in the revised version

- You should explain more about what Choi and Varian do and what you do before you insert the table.

I will do this in the revised version

- Is a possible reason why the US Sales series differs from Varians that the US government revised the series at some point?

That is indeed a likely reason

- Another replication possibility is to try other search terms for the same topic. One could even ask the initial authors how many terms they tried before settling on that particular one.

In the paper, the authors wrote: ‘A little experimentation shows that two of these categories, Trucks & SUVs and Automotive Insurance significantly improve in-sample fit when added to this regression.’