































**Weaknesses:** - There is a contradiction between the claims in the abstract and the major contributions mentioned in the introduction.

- There is no novelty in analyzing the data. The techniques that are used have also been used in previous studies on Internet video services.

**Comments to Authors:** In the abstract/introduction, please clarify if the behavior of the users is different in the mobile TV service and the landline service; there is a lot of confusion. In the summary you repeat that the pattern in the mobile TV and the landline TV is similar.

It would be nice if you could comment on the reasons why there is some initial delay in the beginning of the session. Is this due to protocol, the state of the server, or the power-up of the received mobile device.

It would be also nice to comment on the effect of the device and the access technology used by then end-users.

It would be nice to comment if there are any failures in receiving data or if there any restrictions in accessing channels.

Figure 1 does not add anything in the understanding of the system.

## Response from the Authors

We thank all the reviewers for their valuable comments and feedbacks. These comments are tremendously helpful and improve our work.

In the following, we outline the revisions and additions in our paper that address the reviewers' comments:

1. As suggested by several reviewers, a brief description of typical 3G data pricing plans in China is added in section 3.1

2. As suggested by reviewer 1, we went through all the data traces, and emulated all the video sessions. The detailed video quality assessment results are added in section 4.2 in the revised paper.

3. When comparing user accesses to audio and video sessions, the reviewers are right that multiple reasons may account for the longer session length for audio. We have thus removed the mention on the "main factor", and now simply present a detailed analysis of the data.

4. We have clarified in section 3.3 how the 3G/Wifi information from dataset 2 is utilized to identify the access network type in dataset 1.

5. Regarding the comment by reviewer5, we have revised the introduction to emphasize the differences between landline IPTV and mobile TV systems.

6. We clarified in section 3.1 that the CNLive service offered more than 120 different TV channels and 16 different audio channels. Each video channel has a constant bitrate of 256kbps and each audio channel has a constant bitrate of 32kbps.

7. As suggested by reviewer4, there might be other reasons for the session length difference between WiFi and 3G. We have added more discussion in section 5.5 regarding this issue.

8. As suggested by reviewer 4, the transmitted but not viewed content wastes valuable bandwidth. This issue is important in the design of buffering scheme and content delivery network. We felt that more detailed analysis on this issue is warranted and could be left as future works, and have added a brief discussion in Sec. 6.

9. Specific comments regarding Fig. 3(a), initial buffering, GeoIP database references, correlation between dataset 1 and 2, CDN's effect on wireless spectrum usage, are addressed accordingly in the revised text.

We did not address the comment by reviewer3 regarding user mobility. This is because the client software did not collect user location from the GPS, thus we did not have detailed mobility information.

Finally, as suggested by multiple reviewers, we have asked a native English speaker to proofread the paper.