

Electronic Supplementary Material

Investigating the effect of online and offline reputation on the provision of online counseling services: A case study of the Internet hospitals in China

Ronghua XU (✉), Tingting ZHANG

School of Management, Zhejiang University of Technology, Hangzhou 310014, China

E-mail: ronghuaxu@zjut.edu.cn

Qingpeng ZHANG

School of Data Science, City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China

Supplementary Table S1 Correlations of variables (with the sample of the whole data)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1 Online consultation volume	1						
2 Professional title	-0.015**	1					
3 Hospital ranking	-0.037**	0.166**	1				
4 City level	-0.017**	0.095**	0.140**	1			
5 Number of patients' comments	0.392**	0.038**	-0.007**	0.083**	1		
6 Satisfaction score	0.127**	0.126**	0.071**	0.223**	0.296**	1	
7 Number of following patients	0.085**	0.101**	0.028**	0.144**	0.663**	0.313**	1

Notes: ** $P < 0.01$. There are 141029 observations.

Supplementary Table S2 Correlations of variables (with the samples under the criteria of 20)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1 Online consultation volume	1						
2 Professional title	-0.086**	1					
3 Hospital ranking	-0.138**	0.370**	1				
4 City level	-0.169**	0.330**	0.383**	1			
5 Number of patients' comments	0.425**	-0.009	-0.076**	0.024*	1		
6 Satisfaction score	0.023*	-0.054**	0.003	0.028*	0.066**	1	
7 Number of following patients	0.067**	0.210**	0.064**	0.224**	0.561**	-0.003	1

Notes: ** $P < 0.01$. There are 7716 observations.

Supplementary Table S3 Correlations of variables (with the samples under the criteria of 35)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1 Online consultation volume	1						
2 Professional title	-0.091**	1					
3 Hospital ranking	-0.143**	0.388**	1				
4 City level	-0.184**	0.358**	0.406**	1			
5 Number of patients' comments	0.413**	-0.006	-0.073**	0.025	1		
6 Satisfaction score	0.007	-0.053**	0.012	-0.034**	0.051**	1	
7 Number of following patients	0.054**	0.231**	0.078**	0.239**	0.551**	-0.034**	1

Notes: ** $P < 0.01$. There are 5941 observations.

Supplementary Table S4 Correlations of variables (with the samples under the criteria of 65)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1 Online consultation volume	1						
2 Professional title	-0.097**	1					
3 Hospital ranking	-0.143**	0.398**	1				
4 City level	-0.206**	0.395**	0.420**	1			
5 Number of patients' comments	0.395**	-0.004	-0.060**	0.027	1		
6 Satisfaction score	-0.014	-0.099**	0.021	-0.046**	0.037**	1	
7 Number of following patients	0.035**	0.259**	0.097**	0.259**	0.533**	-0.068**	1

Notes: ** $P < 0.01$. There are 4223 observations.

Supplementary Table S5 Correlations of variables (with the samples under the criteria of 80)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1 Online consultation volume	1						
2 Professional title	-0.096**	1					
3 Hospital ranking	-0.139**	0.412**	1				
4 City level	-0.214**	0.411**	0.431**	1			
5 Number of patients' comments	0.388**	0.000	-0.051**	0.026	1		
6 Satisfaction score	-0.023	-0.107**	0.021	-0.042*	0.037*	1	
7 Number of following patients	0.031	0.273**	0.111**	0.263**	0.526**	-0.072**	1

Notes: ** $P < 0.01$. There are 3705 observations.

Supplementary Table S6 The results of the robustness test (with the sub-samples of the original sample)

	Step 1	Step 2	
		Model 1	Model 2
FollowingPatients*SatisfactionScore			0.022
FollowingPatients*PatientsComments			-0.240***
CityLevel*ProfessionalTitle		-0.107	
CityLevel*HospitalRanking		-0.175***	
Satisfaction score	0.037**	0.032**	0.026*
Professional title	-0.084***	-0.050***	-0.074***
Hospital ranking	-0.160***	-0.050**	-0.147***
Number of patients' comments	0.563***	0.570***	0.703***
Adjusted <i>R</i> -square	0.376	0.390	0.413
Durbin–Watson (DW) statistics	1.756	1.792	1.760

Note: *** $P < 0.001$, ** $P < 0.01$, * $P < 0.05$. The values in the table are the standardized coefficients.