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Reviewer's report:

The submitted paper reported a quantitative approach to gauge the influence of health professional capital and health team heterogeneity on online health communities (services). This paper is highly appropriate in a couple of aspects: 1, Online health services are an emerging research topic in the fields of health services, health informatics, etc. The contribution of this paper is mostly on the behavioral and health care quality, to the best of my understanding. 2, This paper reports new findings with an interesting angle. There are sufficient data from online health communities, especially in China but well-conducted empirical studies are sparse. This paper seeks answers to a number of interesting questions grounded by Upper Echelons Theory and Social Exchange Theory. 3, The statistical procedures are appropriate, even that the design may not be as simple as it should be. But it should be okay as for an exploratory work with limited references. The findings are clearly reported.

Major concerns:
1. The paper could be improved is authors can draw a strong connection between the reported findings and (1) health care safety and quality and (2) health informatics, specifically, consumer health informatics and health information technology. I believe the findings can make unique contributions to the safety and quality of online health services in many perspectives. The findings are also relevant to incentives and challenges of informatics study regarding the emergence of online health communities. For a recent literature review, see https://preprints.jmir.org/preprint/12521

Minor concerns:
1. The Conclusion section of the Abstract is oversimplified.
2. Please check types of tense thoroughly. The types of tense of verbs indicate whether a work is done already or is in process. For example, on page 8, "Hongseok et al. demonstrate that group social capital". Do you mean "demonstrated"? On page 9, ", so we conduct a conceptual model that ". Is the model completed or to be developed?
3. I think authors meant "Table 5" instead of "Table 6" by the end of Results-Robustness test, on page 22.
4. It's usually not necessary to declare re-occurred abbreviations they were declared at the first occurrence. For example, TSD in the Discussion section. And some others.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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