

How Does the Adoption of Ad Blockers Affect News Consumption?

Shunyao Yan, Klaus M. Miller, Bernd Skiera[†]

Goethe University Frankfurt

July, 2021

Abstract: Ad blockers allow users to browse websites without viewing ads. Online news providers that rely on advertising revenue tend to perceive users' adoption of ad blockers purely as a threat to revenue. Yet, this perception ignores the possibility that avoiding ads—which users presumably dislike—may affect users' online news consumption behavior in positive ways. Using 3.1 million anonymized visits from 79,856 registered users on a news website, we find that adopting an ad blocker has a robust positive effect on the quantity and variety of articles users consume (21.5% - 43.3% more articles and 13.4% - 29.1% more content categories). An increase in repeat user visits of the news website, rather than the number of page impressions per visit, drives the news consumption. These visits tend to start with direct navigation to the news website, indicating user loyalty. The increase in news consumption is more substantial for users who have less prior experience with the website. We discuss how news publishers could benefit from these findings, including exploring revenue models that consider users' desire to avoid ads.

Keywords: ad blocker, online advertising, news consumption, monetization of content

[†] Department of Marketing, Faculty of Business and Economics, Theodor-W.-Adorno-Platz 4, 60323 Frankfurt am Main. Email: yan@wiwi.uni-frankfurt.de; klaus.miller@wiwi.uni-frankfurt.de; skiera@wiwi.uni-frankfurt.de.

Ad blockers are software programs, usually browser extensions, that internet users can download to block advertising. They are highly popular, with recent reports suggesting that almost 50% of internet users between the ages of 16–64 are likely to have used an ad blocker within a given month (Kemp 2020). Despite their popularity, little empirical knowledge exists about how ad blockers impact advertisers, publishers, i.e., websites offering ad slots, or users. What is clear, however, is that neither publishers nor advertisers like ad blockers. Representatives of the advertising industry have described ad blockers as plain “robbery” and an “existential threat to the industry” (IAB 2015), and publishers have (unsuccessfully) sued providers of ad blockers for anti-competitive conduct, copyright infringement, and all kinds of unethical business practice (Toulas 2019).

The industry pushback against ad blockers exposes a potentially problematic assumption underlying the advertising revenue model—an assumption rarely explicitly discussed in articles on such models (e.g., Lambrecht et al. (2014)). Specifically, the advertising model assumes that users will be willing to ‘pay’ the publisher for the content they consume by enduring exposure to ads. However, the popularity of ad blockers suggests that, for many users, the price is too high: Users do not like ads, and indeed, this dislike seems to be the primary motivation for using an ad blocker (Sołtysik-Piorunkiewicz et al. 2019; Vratonjic et al. 2013).

Herein, we provide publishers with a more nuanced and potentially more positive view of ad blockers by taking an in-depth look at how adopting an ad blocker affects users’ behavior on a publisher’s website. In particular, we suggest that, in light of users’ dislike of

ads, their adoption of an ad blocker might lead them to behave differently than they would do when exposed to ads. These behaviors could be positive from the publisher's perspective. For example, exposure to annoying and distracting ads might interfere with users' news consumption on a news site. In such a case, ad blockers could encourage users to consume and engage with more of the publisher's content.

To explore these ideas, we exploit a unique individual-level panel dataset from a reputed news website containing the data of 3.1 million visits of 79,856 registered users. Our dataset provides information about users' news reading behavior, their usage of ad blockers, and the timing of their adoption (or dis-adoption) of ad blockers. We use this dataset to empirically examine the effects of ad blocker adoption on users' news consumption, measured by the quantity and the variety of news consumption. Our analysis incorporates numerous robustness checks, including multiple alternative definitions of treatment. We further explore potential mechanisms for these effects by investigating users' behavior within and across visits. We evaluate the heterogeneity of the effects across different news categories and different subsets of users (e.g., users with varying levels of user experience with our news website).

Overall, our findings contribute towards a better understanding of the effects of ad blockers on users' behavior and reveal some of the benefits of ad blockers to publishers. Accordingly, they assist publishers in identifying alternative revenue models beyond the advertising model that could be more suitable for the news consumption context.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Our study draws from and contributes to three main streams of literature.

First, we contribute to the understanding of the *effects of ad blocking*. A recent review paper identified ad blockers as one of the four primary sources of market inefficiency in digital advertising that warrant further research (Gordon et al. 2020). Preceding internet ad blocking, prior work analyzed consumer ad avoidance behavior in different media consumption contexts. Empirical evidence on ad avoidance focused on TV consumption and documented the existence of ad skipping (Danaher 1995) and its impact on consumer shopping behavior (Bronnenberg et al. 2010), and how to optimize the pricing and scheduling of TV advertising to correct for the loss in the audience due to ad skipping (Wilbur et al. 2013).

Among the studies that address internet ad blocking, most take an analytical approach (Aseri et al. 2020; Despotakis et al. 2021), whereas only a few rely on empirical evidence. These empirical studies include the work of Shiller et al. (2018), who used aggregate website-level data to show that an increase in ad blocker users reduces the website's traffic through a decrease in investment in content over three years. Another study by Todri (2021) used consumer-level data to show that ad blocking decreases online purchasing and reduces consumer search across information channels.

Our study contributes to the literature on ad blockers by using an elaborate real-world dataset to empirically investigate the impact of individual-level ad blocker adoption on news consumption—a context in which an understanding of the effects of ad blockers can be of

practical value, given the online news industry's transition from advertising- to subscription-revenue models.

In doing so, our research contributes to a second, growing stream of literature, encompassing an ongoing debate about the *challenges faced by the news industry in the digital world*. This stream of literature has analyzed how social media (Scharkow et al. 2020; Schmidt et al. 2017), news aggregators (Calzada and Gil 2020; Chiou and Tucker 2017), other referral channels (Bar-Gill et al. 2021; Roos et al. 2020), and digital subscription models (e.g., paywalls and subscription fees; Lambrecht and Misra (2017); Aral and Dhillon (2021)) impact the demand for news. We contribute to this literature by analyzing the impact of ad blockers, which have not been studied in the context of news consumption. Notably, studies that examine advertising in conjunction with news consumption have tended to assume that exposure to advertising does not affect users' engagement with the news content itself (Aribarg and Schwartz 2019; Pattabhiramaiah et al. 2018). Our study challenges this assumption, enabling us to question whether the vast popularity of advertising-revenue models in the news industry is justified.

In comparing adoption versus non-adoption of ad blockers, we effectively compare different levels of exposure to advertising. This comparison enables us to contribute to the third stream of literature, the broad literature on *the effects of advertising*. Although advertising has been studied extensively in marketing and economics, prior studies have tended to focus on the success of advertising, as captured by measures such as recall and recognition of ads (Aribarg and Schwartz 2019), click-through (Dinner et al. 2013), view-

through (Chae et al. 2019), sales (Danaher and Dagger 2013), and brand awareness (Bruce et al. 2020). These papers analyze the effectiveness of advertising on different media (Danaher and Dagger 2013) and, more recently, the potential negative marginal return of repetitive advertising exposure (Chae et al. 2019).

Much less research has examined how ads affect the platforms that publish them and users' engagement with those platforms. Among the empirical studies that examine these facets, most focus on non-digital markets (e.g., traditional TV, magazines, and yellow page books), documenting both positive and negative effects of ads on media consumption (Kaiser and Song 2009; Rysman 2004; Wilbur et al. 2013). Studies on digital advertising, in turn, have primarily taken place in highly controlled lab settings and thus are of limited relevance to real-world consumption. These studies have primarily revealed adverse effects of exposure to advertising on website usage (see, e.g., Goldstein et al. (2014)), but real-world evidence is lacking.

EMPIRICAL SETTING, DATASET, AND VARIABLE CONSTRUCTION

We rely on a proprietary dataset from a reputable European news publisher who prefers to remain anonymous. In addition to a printed newspaper, our news publisher runs an online news website that publishes daily news, focusing on politics and business while reporting various other topics. The news website ranks among the top 10 in its country in weekly usage. At the time of our study, around 78% of the traffic to the news website came from its own country. Our news publisher has long been regarded as a national “newspaper of record”

in the industry. Its reputation in its linguistic area is comparable to that of the *New York Times*, the *Financial Times*, or the *Guardian*. During our observation period, the news website offered all content free of charge. Users were required to register with the website (i.e., to enter their email addresses) to access archival content and newsletters but were not required to pay for this content. Approximately 20% of visits to the website came from registered users.

Our dataset was composed of clickstream data for all registered (but anonymized) users who visited the news website from the second week of June 2015 (week 1) to the last week of September 2015 (week 16). We focus on registered users because we can track them at the individual-level over time, which provides us with a unique panel setting. The clickstream data for each registered user included a complete record of that user's browsing behavior (including, among others, the time stamp, the page views, and whether an ad blocker is used) on the news website throughout the data collection period. We further combined the clickstream data with self-reported user demographics from the publisher's CRM database. In total, we analyzed 79,856 unique users with 3.1 million visits.

Information about the Ads on the News Website

Before analyzing how ad blocker adoption affected news consumption on our website, it is essential to acknowledge how ad blockers might have affected users' browsing experience. In most cases, an ad blocker automatically removes all ads on the webpage the user visits—except for websites that the user has whitelisted. Some websites require users to disable their ad blockers to view content; neither our website nor its main competitors did so during the

observation period. Since the internet extensively displays ads, installing an ad blocker can lead to a noticeable difference in the display of a website, as shown in Figure 1, and the respective user experience.

[Insert Figure 1 about here]

Our news website runs display advertising according to the standard advertising formats outlined by the Interactive Advertising Bureau (IAB 2017). More precisely, our website runs leaderboard ads (728×90 pixels) on top of the page and rectangle ads (300×250 to 336×280 pixels) in the middle of the page on both desktop and mobile devices. Also, our website runs skyscraper ads (120×600 pixels) on the side of the page on desktops. On average, there are five display ads on the homepage and three display ads on an article page. These levels of advertising are comparable to, and in some cases even lower than, the levels of advertising on other similar premium news websites such as the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, and the *Guardian*. We further note that our news website does not run large half-page ads (300×600 pixels) or large mobile banner ads (320×100 pixels), whose removal by an ad blocker could lead to substantial changes in the display of the content. In addition, our website did not run native advertising during the observation period of our study.

Ad Blocker Adoption Decisions and Trends in Ad Blocker Usage

Crucial to our identification strategy is that an ad blocker is adopted on the browser and, thus, does not target to remove ads for a specific website. Surveys also suggest that a user's decision to adopt an ad blocker is motivated by ad annoyance, page loading speed, and

privacy concerns (Sołtysik-Piorunkiewicz et al. 2019; Vratonjic et al. 2013). In addition, users may learn accidentally about the existence of ad blockers at different points in time.

Our observation period included an exogenous event that likely increased consumer awareness and, thus, ad blocker adoption: On September 16, 2015, Apple updated its mobile operating system and incorporated the ad blocking feature for the first time. This update was followed by a substantial increase in users' interest in ad blockers, as reflected in a sharp spike in the number of Google searches for the term "ad blocker" in September 2015, as shown in Figure S1 in the Web Appendix. We leverage this external event to run a robustness analysis based on a Heckman selection model (see Web Appendix G); the results of this analysis suggest that nothing specific about a user's news consumption influences their decision to adopt an ad blocker.

Construction of Independent Variables – Ad Blocker Adoption

Our dataset records, for each user, the number of page impressions with blocked ads. We use this information to derive an indicator of ad blocker usage. Specifically, a positive number of page impressions with blocked ads indicates an ad blocker's usage, whereas zero impressions blocked indicates no usage. Of our 79,856 users, 19,088 users used an ad blocker during this period (as indicated by a positive number of ad impressions blocked), and 60,768 users did not. Thus, 24% of users in our dataset used an ad blocker; this percentage is comparable to the ad blocker adoption rates across European countries during that period, ranging from 20% to 38% (Newman et al. 2016).

Whereas our dataset contains records of news consumption from week 1, it only recorded ad blocker usage from week 10 onwards, which creates a potential left-censoring problem. For example, a user with ad blocker usage in week 10 might have used it in week 9 or earlier. Thus, such a user would not experience a change in her exposure to ads. Following an approach to address a similar problem in the context of adopting Spotify (Datta et al. 2018), we designate a two-week cut-off period (e.g., weeks 10 and 11¹) for defining our group of ad blocker adopters. Precisely, we classify users who have zero ad blocker usage in weeks 10 and 11 (i.e., the first two weeks of observed ad blocker usage) and then have non-zero ad blocker usage from week 12 as ad blocker adopters in week 12. Thus, these ad blocker adopters constitute the primary treatment group for our analysis. In addition, we classify a user into the control group, in turn, if the user had no ad blocker usage throughout weeks 10–16. We do not include users who did not visit our website during cut-off weeks (e.g., weeks 10–11) in the analysis².

According to this construction, our treatment group comprises 6,366 users. Our control group comprises 38,270 users (see the top part of Figure 2 to illustrate our construction of the treatment and control groups).

For robustness, we carry out two additional analyses using alternative definitions of treatment and control groups. Our second analysis compares early adopters of an ad blocker (treatment group) to late adopters (control group). We define an early adopter as a user who

¹ We show the robustness of the cut-off threshold by reducing it to 1 week and extending it to 4 weeks in Web Appendix D.

² Users who visited our website during weeks 10–11 but did not return to the website were not considered here because they are pruned out later in the matching process (see Table 3: the last observed week starts from week 13).

adopts an ad blocker in week 12 ($n = 1,124$) and a late adopter as a user who adopts an ad blocker in week 14 ($n = 1,167$). This approach enables us to control for bias related to adopting an ad blocker because both treatment and control groups adopted an ad blocker and only differ in the timing at which they did so.

Our third analysis leverages the fact that, in our sample, 9,055 of the total 79,856 users had already adopted an ad blocker during our cut-off periods (weeks 10 and 11). Thus, they are censored users for whom we cannot identify the timing of adopting an ad blocker. However, we can identify the timing at which they dis-adopted an ad blocker based on their non-zero to zero change in ad blocker usage for these users. Therefore, we use these censored adopters to identify the effect of the abandonment of ad blockers. Precisely, we classify these censored adopters into the treatment group if they change from non-zero to zero ad blocker usage during week 12 or later. In other words, the users in this treatment group ($n = 2,882$) do not see ads in weeks 10 and 11 but start to see ads during week 12 or later. The control group ($n = 6,173$) consists of users in this censored sample who have non-zero ad blocker usage throughout weeks 10–16. The bottom part of Figure 2 depicts the construction of these treatment and control groups.

[Insert Figure 2 about here]

Construction of Dependent Variables

Our analysis considers numerous news consumption and users' behavior measures, which we summarize in Table 1. We report all measures and the corresponding analyses at the user-week level.

Our primary variables of interest are (i) article views, i.e., a count of the number of news articles a user clicks on the news website; this measure captures the *quantity* of news consumption; and (ii) breadth, a count of the number of unique news categories of article views; this measure captures the *variety* of news consumption.

We further explore mechanisms that might underlie the effects of ad exposure on our main variables of interest. For this analysis, we measure variables corresponding to (i) users' behavior within visits—including, for example, the number of article views per visit and time spent on the website per visit; and (ii) users' behavior across visits, including, e.g., the total number of visits, as well as information about the referral sources of these visits (e.g., direct navigation to the news website versus referral from external websites such as social media platforms or search engines). A visit is an entry to our news website that ends with the user clicking away from the website or remaining inactive for 30 minutes. We elaborate the complete list of within- and cross-visit variables in Table 1.

We base our mechanism analysis on the premise that adopting an ad blocker is likely to affect users' behavior through two main channels. The first is a cognitive mechanism, wherein the absence (as opposed to presence) of ads resulting from ad blocker adoption enhances the user's cognitive resources to process website content. We suggest that a cognitive mechanism is likely to manifest in short-term, within-visit effects, such as an adoption-induced increase in the number of article views per visit. The second potential mechanism is a learning mechanism. User experience with an ad blocker helps users learn how well their preferences match the website and increase their desire to return to the website. This mechanism manifests in the

repeat visits and especially direct navigation to the website instead of referring channels.

Additional variables. To obtain a more detailed understanding of the main effects observed and establish robustness, we also count the number of article views separately for each news category (e.g., political news and economic news). We report all news categories of our website in Panel 2 of Table 1. In addition, we count the number of page views on the home page. The page views from news articles and the home page account for more than 90% of the browsing behavior during our observation period. Other browsing behaviors on our news website include browsing account-related pages and the weather forecast.

[Insert Table 1 about here]

Descriptive Statistics and Preliminary Analysis

Recall that our primary analysis is on two groups of users: ad blocker adopters (treatment group) and non-ad blocker adopters (control group). We report in Table 2 the group means of our main dependent variables: article views and breadth, a before-and-after difference within each of the two groups, and a difference-in-differences (DiD) comparison between groups.

We start with the before-and-after analysis. For treated users (ad blocker adopters), all news consumption measures increase after treatment. However, these measures decrease for the control group (non-ad blocker adopters), leading to a positive value when we compute a simple DiD estimator (e.g., +1.89 for article views and +0.62 for breadth; see the last column of Table 2 for all adopters). These results provide preliminary evidence of the positive effect of ad blocker adoption on news consumption in terms of both quantity and variety. However, self-selection into ad blocker adoption could confound the DiD reported in Table 2.

[Insert Table 2 about here]

In the next section, we describe our approach to remove any potential confounders from self-selection. To identify the causal effect of ad blocker adoption on news consumption, we combine matching with DiD, and establish robustness by repeating the analysis with the alternative treatment and control definitions outlined above.

IDENTIFICATION STRATEGY

Selection bias into treatment can come from both observable and unobservable confounders.

In our analysis, we first non-parametrically control for observable confounders using coarsened exact matching (CEM). Then, to remove any time-invariant unobserved confounders, we use DiD with individual-level fixed effects. As for time-varying confounders, we use a placebo treatment test to show that they do not bias our results. In what follows, we describe the identification strategy for our primary analysis, in which ad blocker adoption at week 12 and onward (as outlined above) serves as a treatment. We use a similar strategy in our two robustness analyses, in which, respectively, early adoption and dis-adoption of an ad blocker serve as treatment (see above).

Recall that our sample covers 16 weeks, running from June 8, 2015, to September 27, 2015. Our treatment starts from week 12. We use the first 11 weeks, i.e., the entire pre-treatment period, for matching. For our estimation, we use weeks 7 to 11 as the pre-treatment period and the remaining weeks, weeks 12 to 16, as the post-treatment period. We also use

weeks 1 to 11 as a pre-treatment period in an additional robustness check, reported in Web Appendix Table S10, which confirms the robustness of our results.

Coarsened Exact Matching

To remove observable confounders, we use matching to refine our treatment and control groups. The statistical treatment effects literature commonly combines matching methods with DiD (Heckman et al. 1998). We chose CEM for its advantages over other matching methods (such as propensity score matching; see King and Nielsen (2019)) in terms of balancing the covariates (Iacus et al. 2012) when the number of covariates is not large. We also use propensity score matching as a robustness check (Web Appendix Table S6). The results remain similar.

CEM is a nonparametric method of controlling for observed confounders (more commonly called “covariates” in the matching literature; herein, the two terms are used interchangeably). CEM involves matching on a vector of covariates (instead of on a scalar representing a distance metric summarizing all covariates, as in other matching methods) and using the covariates’ original dimensions. Categorical covariates can be kept at their original values. In contrast, continuous covariates are ‘coarsened’ into bins (e.g., the number of page views per week, which may range between 1 and 50, can be coarsened into the bins 1 to 5, 6 to 10, etc.). Then, CEM conducts exact matching with all covariates, with the continuous covariates coarsened.

Each observation belongs to a unique stratum containing all observations with identical values of all covariates (e.g., a male who is 30-35 years old, who views 11-15 pages a week,

is placed in a stratum containing other males who are 30-35 years' old who view 11-15 pages a week). CEM keeps all treated and control units within a stratum (as all observations have the same values for the covariates within a stratum) and adjusts the unequal number of matched treated and control units with weights (which we further use in our regression analysis). Strata containing zero-treated units or zero-control units are pruned, and the remaining strata are weighted according to the number of observations they contain for further analysis.

In this way, CEM balances the covariates on their original dimensions and eliminates differences in covariates between the treatment and control group in all moments, quantiles, and functional forms (Iacus et al. 2012). In contrast, other matching methods that focus on the univariate balance of the means of covariates (e.g., through estimating and matching on a propensity score obtained from a logit regression on covariates) might not remove, and in fact, can even increase, bias due to imbalances of other moments or functional forms (King and Nielsen 2019).

We can then combine CEM with other causal inference methods, which normally require a model. In these cases, the application of CEM (as opposed to reliance on a full, non-matched sample or a sample matched by another model-dependent matching method) can help decrease model dependence and statistical bias (Iacus et al. 2012; Zervas et al. 2017). However, when the number of covariates gets large, it can be challenging to find exactly matched pairs, even with coarsened variables. In this case, matching based on a univariate

score (such as propensity score) is more efficient. In addition, a univariate score also helps in terms of visualization, as we did in Figure 3.

We match the treatment and control groups based on the following covariates³. First, we include three controls for *demographics*—age, gender, and income—as prior empirical studies show that these demographics are important determinants of news consumption (Fan 2013; Roos et al. 2020) and ad blocker usage (Sołtysik-Piorunkiewicz et al. 2019; Zhao et al. 2017). Second, we match users on *pre-treatment browsing* behavior, namely, article views, breadth, and numbers of visits. Third, to make sure users are active throughout the same observation window and to reduce bias related to a user’s visit behavior or active time, we include a user’s *first and last observed week* in the matching process. Finally, we include the two variables that stay significant when we model the users’ ad blocker adoption process (reported in Table S14 of Web Appendix G): *most frequently used browser* and *mobile page views in the pre-treatment period*.

[Insert Table 3 about here]

Table 3 compares the matched and unmatched samples of the treatment group (ad blocker adopters) and the control group (non-ad blocker adopters) regarding the observed characteristics that we use for matching. Before matching, we examine how user demographics impact the ad blocker adoption probability using logistic regression in Web Appendix K (Table S22). We find that the odds of being an ad blocker adopter in the male

³ We note the tradeoff in using demographic data for matching by introducing a selection problem, as those who report their demographics in CRM data can be different from those who do not report. However, in the Web Appendix Table S4, we confirm that demographic data are missing at random. We also report the estimation results using unmatched data as a robustness check. The results remain similar.

group is 1.33 times that of being an ad blocker in the female group and the odds of being an ad blocker adopter in the Income Index 2 group is 0.63 times that of being an ad blocker in the Income Index 1 group. The right part of Table 3 shows that, after matching, the treatment group and the control group are balanced in all the matching variables.

Figure 3 provides further validation to our matching process; specifically, it depicts the distributions of the ‘propensity scores’, the distance metric obtained by running a logistic regression with all matching variables, the treatment group, and the control group before and after CEM. Figure 3 shows that CEM balanced the treatment and control groups by creating a similar empirical distribution of the matching variables and thus increasing the common support (or overlap) between these two groups. Figure 3 also shows that CEM removes the most likely and the least likely ad blocker adopters from the sample. Thus, in effect, we mimic an experimental setting in which users in the treatment and control group are equally likely to adopt an ad blocker but decide at random whether to adopt it or not.

CEM removes the differences in all observed covariates, and thus any remaining selection bias can only come from unobservable confounders, which we discuss in the next section.

[Insert Figure 3 about here]

Difference-in-Differences (DiD)

Having produced our matched treatment and control samples, we subsequently apply DiD with individual-level fixed effects, removing time-invariant unobserved confounders by taking the temporal differences within each user. We eliminate all variation in news

consumption caused by time-invariant unobserved heterogeneity between individuals (e.g., differences in education or preference towards news or ads). In addition, DiD removes any bias due to time trends that are common to both groups (e.g., resulting from seasonality or news shocks) by taking the difference once again across groups.

Specifically, we estimate the following DiD model:

$$(1) \quad Y_{it} = \alpha_i + \delta_t + \beta_1 * I_{it1}(\text{within 1 week of Treatment}_{it}) + \beta_2 * I_{it2}(\text{remaining weeks since Treatment}_{it}) + \varepsilon_{it},$$

where Y_{it} is the dependent variable, one of the news consumption measures listed in Table 1, for user i in week t ; α_i is a user-fixed effect, controlling for time-constant differences across users, such as education or tastes towards news; δ_t is a week-fixed effect, controlling for common trends or changes over time that affect all users equally, such as breaking news; I_{it1} is an indicator variable that is equal to one if the observation for individual i in week t is within one week after the treatment (so that this binary variable is one in the treated week and the following weeks); I_{it2} is an indicator variable that is equal to one if the observation of individual i in week t is after one week post-treatment (so that this binary variable is 1 from week 2 to week 5 post-adoption); β_1 captures the effect for the treated week, i.e., the adoption week, and one week post-adoption; β_2 captures the effect for the remaining weeks (week 2 to week 5 post-adoption); and ε_{it} is the error term, clustered at the user-level.

Our identification strategy builds upon the changes in news consumption after treatment (in our primary analysis, adopting an ad blocker). Crucial for this identification is that all confounders are either controlled for or quasi-random; that is, any unobserved time-varying

confounders follow parallel trends in the pre-treatment periods. In the Web Appendix A, we formally test this identification condition and show that this identification assumption holds for all dependent variables using a placebo treatment test (Angrist and Pischke 2008).

RESULTS

Main Effects on Quantity and Variety of News Consumption

We are primarily interested in two measures of news consumption: the number of article views (i.e., the quantity of news consumption) and the number of news categories to which viewed articles correspond (i.e., the variety of news consumption). Panel 1 of Table 4 reports these results for our primary analysis and our two robustness analyses with alternative treatment and control group designs. The dependent variables are the natural logarithms of news consumption measures (with 1 added to correct for zero values); thus, a simple transformation of β_i in the regression model (1) can be locally approximated as a percentage change in news consumption: $\exp(\beta_1) - 1$ reports the effect during the week of treatment and the following week (referred to as a ‘1-week effect’) and $\exp(\beta_2) - 1$ reports a 5-week effect. However, as we add 1 to the dependent variable and our dependent variable Y is rather small, the percentage increase is constantly underestimated by $(1 - \frac{Y}{Y+1})\%$. We thus correct for this underestimation at the median value of the dependent variables (which we report in Table 1) by multiplying our percentage increase by $\frac{Y+1}{Y}$. We checked the robustness of the results regarding the decision to use a log-transformation and adding one to the dependent variable (see Web Appendix H) and found that the results remained consistent.

[Insert Table 4 about here]

Our primary analysis used ad blocker adopters as a treatment group and ad blocker non-adopters as a control group. We find a significant and consistent positive effect of ad blocker adoption on both the quantity and variety of news consumption. For the quantity of news consumption (see the first column in Panel 1 of Table 4), the number of article views increases by 21.5% ($= (\exp(0.155) - 1) * 1.25$) at the median (4), lasting even 5 weeks after adoption. The increase is larger within the treated week and one week of the treatment: 43.3% ($= (\exp(0.297) - 1) * 1.25$) at the median. The variety of news consumption, in turn, increases by 13.4% ($= (\exp(0.096) - 1) * 1.33$) at the median (3) over 5 weeks, with a 1-week increase of 29.1% ($= (\exp(0.198) - 1) * 1.33$) at the median.

Our second analysis, in which we compared early adopters (treatment group) who adopted an ad blocker at week 12 with late adopters (control group) who adopted at week 14, produced results consistent with those of our primary analysis. In this analysis, β_1 measures the effect of ad blocker adoption on news consumption during the period in which early adopters had already adopted an ad blocker but late adopters had not (i.e., week 12 and week 13). β_2 measures the effect of early adoption on news consumption over 5 weeks of post-treatment (i.e., week 12 to week 16). Notably, we do not expect to find a 5-week effect as in the previous analysis because the control group in this analysis adopts an ad blocker only two weeks after the treatment group's adoption.

In line with our expectations, we find a positive and significant effect during week 12 and week 13 and do not find any significant effect over 5 weeks. Specifically, early adopters increased the quantity of their news consumption by 49.2% ($= (\exp(0.332) - 1) * 1.25$) at the

median and increased the variety of their consumption by 30.6% ($= (\exp(0.207) - 1) * 1.33$) at the median during week 12 and week 13. These estimates are numerically similar and stay within the standard error of those obtained in the previous analysis.

Our third and last complementary analysis, in which users who abandoned ad blockers served as the treatment group and users who used ad blockers throughout the entire observation period (weeks 10–16) served as a control group, further supports the robustness of our findings. Specifically, we find that users who abandoned ad blockers decreased their quantity of news consumption by 25.6% ($= (\exp(0.23) - 1) * 1.25$) at the median and the variety of their news consumption by 19.2% ($= (\exp(0.135) - 1) * 1.33$) at the median within 1 week of dis-adoption. This result only retains the sign that is consistent with the results of the previous two approaches, but not the significance level. One reason is that CEM matching process drops many observations. Indeed, in the Web Appendix E, we present a robustness check without matching (Table S12), in which we find that ad blocker abandoners significantly decrease their news consumption over 5 weeks.

Taken together, the findings of these three analyses support the positive effect of ad blocker adoption on both the quantity and the variety of news consumption.

Effect of Ad Blocker Adoption on Quantity of News Consumption, by News Category

Having established the effect of ad blocker adoption on the quantity and variety of news consumption, we decompose in Panel 2 of Table 4 the effect on article views into various news and non-news categories. These categories include ‘hard’ news (political news, economic news, and opinion news, following Angelucci and Cagé (2019)); ‘soft’ news

(sports, culture & art, lifestyle news), and non-news article pages (e.g., account settings and play pages that include games such as Sudoku or Mahjong). For clarity of presentation, in what follows, we only report the results of our primary analysis, with ad blocker adopters as the treatment group and non-adopters as the control group. The results obtained with our alternative treatment definitions (early adoption of ad blockers or ad blocker abandonment) remain substantively the same, and we report them in the Web Appendix E.

We find that the increase in article views attributable to ad blocker adoption is driven primarily by increases in the consumption of hard news. None of the soft news categories has significant effects over 5 weeks, though there is a 1-week effect for Sports and Art & Culture. In addition, our analysis reveals no effect of ad blocker adoption on views of non-news pages. In the Web Appendix I, we report the complete results for each category (including science news, finance news, and news ticker, which Cagé (2020) also classified ‘hard’ news, i.e., news that affects the political process).

Within-Visit Effects: Exploring a Cognitive Mechanism

Previous studies have shown that ads have a cognitive impact on consumers, regardless of whether consumers pay attention to them (Vakratsas and Ambler 1999). The reason is that our brain processes information both consciously and subconsciously (Kahneman 1973). Thus, one potential explanation for the increases we observe in news consumption after adopting an ad blocker (e.g., as in Panel 1 of Table 4) may be the increased availability of cognitive resources attributable to not seeing as many ads. If this explanation holds, then we should expect to observe post-adoption changes in behavior within individual visits for two

reasons. The cognitive system for processing information is the working memory that functions in the short-term (Baddeley 1992), and a visit is, by definition, a short-term period of engagement with the site (recall that a visit ends when the user actively clicks away or stays inactive for 30 minutes).

Panel 1 of Table 5 shows that the number of article views per visit increased by only 13.9% ($= (\exp(0.067) - 1) * 2$) at the median within 1 week, which is much less than the 1-week increase of 43.3% of total article views (as reported in Panel 1 of Table 4). The number of other page views (e.g., homepage views) per visit also only increases by 7.7% ($= (\exp(0.047) - 1) * 1.6$) at the median.

[Insert Table 5 about here]

Another means by which the availability of additional cognitive resources (attributable to ad blocker adoption) might influence users' news consumption behavior is by enabling them to read longer or more complex articles. To explore this possibility, we scraped the titles of all the articles (i.e., the headlines) that users clicked on and analyzed the length of these titles (by measuring the number of words). It serves users as an indicator for the expected length and complexity of the respective news article. We find the title length per visit increased by 18.6% ($= (\exp(0.146) - 1) * 1.18$) at the median within 1 week while the title length per article did not increase significantly.

In addition, we checked the effect on time spent per visit, which is an engagement metric commonly known in the industry as dwell time (i.e., the time that a user spends on the website before clicking away). We find that the time spent per visit increased by 47.4%

(= $(\exp(0.387) - 1) * 1$) at the median over 1 week and by 24.3% (= $(\exp(0.217) - 1) * 1$) at the median over 5 weeks after ad blocker adoption. This result suggests that ad blocker adoption might have enabled users to devote more attention to the articles they read, even though they did not read more news articles within each visit.

Effects across Visits: Exploring a Learning Mechanism

So far, these results provide the first suggestive evidence that ad blocker adoption elicited cognitive effects among users. Yet, these effects explain only a small part of the increase in the quantity of news consumption after the ad blocker adoption, suggesting that an increase in the number of visits to the website drives the major part of the increase. Indeed, we find both a 1-week increase and a 5-week increase in website visits (see column “Visits” in Panel 2 of Table 5). These effect sizes are comparable to those corresponding to the effect of the treatment on article views (Panel 1 of Table 4), which further supports the robustness of our main result.

Learning, the process of acquiring knowledge and experience about a product, provides an intuitive explanation for this increase in the number of visits (Johnson et al. 2003). In particular, the usage of ad blockers may have affected users’ experience of the site (e.g., by enhancing their enjoyment), thereby encouraging them to visit it more frequently.

Hoch and Deighton (1989) suggest that learning involves actively seeking experience with a product. To explore whether users engaged in an active information-seeking process, we separately analyzed visits to the news website of each referral source. Specifically, users could visit the news website directly (e.g., by using a bookmark or directly typing in the

URL) or could be referred by a social media website (e.g., Facebook), a search engine (primarily Google) or an email with a newsletter of the newspaper. We find that the users directly visiting the news website drive the increase in article views, indicating an active seeking process. It indicates that users enjoy the website experience when using an ad blocker and start to develop routines and habits associated with the website. Such routines and habits might last even longer than our observation period and represent an actual long-term effect, particularly given the inherently recurring nature of news consumption (DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach 1989).

Notably, our observation of an active information-seeking process can also explain the observed increase in the variety of news consumption: Users might have actively sought to experience more aspects of the news website, which may have led them to explore additional news categories.

Overall, these results enable us to conjecture regarding the mechanism of these effects, suggesting that they are more consistent with consumer learning (and less consistent with enhanced availability of cognitive resources due to reduction of ad exposure). However, the evidence on the underlying theoretical mechanism is only suggestive; conclusively distinguishing and identifying the mechanism is beyond the scope of this paper and would be an exciting avenue for future research.

Heterogeneous Treatment Effects Across Users with Different Characteristics

To obtain a more detailed understanding of the effects observed, we reran our analyses (regression (1)) while distinguishing among users according to specific characteristics of

interest, namely the number of browsers used to access the website and the frequency of website usage before treatment. Table 6 presents the results of these analyses.

Single- vs. multiple-browser usage. In 2015, very few browsers blocked advertising by default. Instead, users had to install an ad blocker in their browsers and, when using multiple browsers (on a single device or across multiple devices), users had to install an ad blocker for each browser. In addition, not all browsers enabled an ad blocking feature (e.g., ad blocking was not feasible in the Apple mobile browser before September 2015, when iOS9 launched).

Our definition of ad blocker adoption included every user who has blocked at least one ad in the analyses described above. For users who use multiple browsers, however, this definition does not necessarily imply a total absence of exposure to ads; that is, a particular user might block ads on one browser yet view them on another. In such cases, the effect of ad blocker adoption should be weaker than in cases in which all ads are blocked. Our dataset enabled us to explore this idea, as it reveals which browser (including whether the device is a mobile or desktop) each user used to access our website; 54% of ad blocker adopters used multiple browsers. We reran our analyses, distinguishing between users who used multiple browsers and those who did not. As shown in Panel 1 of Table 6, we found that ad blocker adoption indeed had a larger effect on news consumption (both in terms of quantity and variety) for single-browser users than for multiple-browser users.

Usage frequency. We also shed light on how the effect differs across users with different prior experiences with the website. Previous studies found that heavy users are more likely to perform information-and variety-seeking behavior on the internet or online platform (Assael

2005; Gu et al. 2021). However, it is also more difficult for heavy users to increase their time on one platform even further. Our results show that light users (i.e., users whose frequency of visiting the website was below the median in the pre-treatment period) stronger increase their news consumption than heavy users (whose frequency of visiting the website was above the median) after adopting ad blockers. As shown in Panel 2 of Table 6, the effects were only significant within 1-week post-treatment for the heavy users. These results are also consistent with a potential learning mechanism: users who have less prior experience with the website are more strongly affected. Worth noticing, the light users in our analysis are registered users whose news consumption level is higher than that of non-registered users.

[Insert Table 6 about here]

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

We used data from 3.1 million anonymized visits from 79,856 users on a news website to show that ad blocker adoption has a robust positive effect on news consumption. Further, we find that the increase in news consumption is driven by users visiting the news site more frequently (instead of reading more articles per visit), primarily through direct navigation to the website (instead of referral visits from social media).

This study offers several practical insights beyond contributing empirical evidence regarding the relationship between ad blocker adoption and news consumption. Our findings challenge the conventional assumption that users' adoption of ad blockers, which interferes with publishers' advertising revenue, is exclusively negative for publishers. Indeed, the

increased engagement of ad blocker users would not directly translate into advertising revenue. However, ad blockers filter out more ad-sensitive users and leave the publishers with users who are more willing to get exposure to ads. Our analysis of the ad blocker adoption decision on user demographics shows that female users and high income users are less likely to adopt an ad blocker than male users and low income users. Thus, the users who remain exposed to advertising on our website have a more valuable demographic profile than the demographic profile of the users who are not exposed to advertising on our website (Lambrecht and Tucker 2019). Suppose publishers could further exploit this heterogeneity in ad sensitivity by selling subscriptions to ad blocker users and increasing the ad intensity for non-ad blocker users; they could achieve higher returns in revenue (Despotakis et al. 2021).

Furthermore, our results reveal that ad blocking increases users' consumption of news, in addition to enhancing other measures of engagement and retention with the publisher's website (e.g., frequency of visits). These enhanced engagements of ad blocker users could translate into subscription revenues, which more and more news publishers rely on. Our publisher introduced a paywall after our observation period. The paywall offered different subscription plans but still showed ads to all users independent of their subscription status. 1.5 years after the paywall introduction, the subscription rate of ad blocker users is 30.13% higher than the subscription rate of non-ad blocker users. This higher share outlines the potential of ad blocker users to contribute to the subscription revenue. Publishers also recognize that ad blocker users are usually more willing to pay for some kinds of subscriptions (Yeon 2020), which further supports our finding. In addition, we also found that

ad blocker adoption had a stronger effect on the news consumption of light users. In this way, ad blockers can “convert” light users into heavy users, and heavy users are more likely to subscribe than light users (Anderson et al. 2020).

Another implication of our findings is that news providers relying on online subscription models should reconsider the current practice of displaying ads even to users who pay for subscriptions. Most subscription-based news websites offer two versions of the website: a free version and a paid version. The free version comes with some restrictions; e.g., non-paying users can access only a subset of the content of the paid version or only a limited number of articles, whereas paying users have unlimited access. However, it is common to expose both sets of users to advertising (Lindsay 2018). Nevertheless, users claim that ads interrupt the web browsing experience, slow it down, and intrude on their privacy (Sołtysik-Piorunkiewicz et al. 2019). Offering a paid but ad-free version of a news website could provide a subscription incentive for loyal users who wish to support the site but do not wish to endure these effects of exposure to ads (Appel et al. 2020; Westcott et al. 2019).

One limitation of our result is the short observation period, especially compared to Shiller et al. (2018), who cover three years and outline a decrease in publishers’ traffic and ad revenue, leading to decreased news production. Further research could investigate how subscription revenue could compensate for the declining ad revenue and how ad blocking causally impacts subscription decisions.

Another limitation of our study is that we could not observe news consumption across multiple news platforms. All the effects we identify are local to our news website. We caution

the readers that our results may not generalize to all online news platforms, considering ad blocker's impact differs across websites with different amounts of ads. We could not perform a formal analysis because we do not have information about the specific ads running on our website or its competitors' websites during the data collection period. However, we try to examine the direction of the bias that competing sites might have on our estimated effects by comparing the number of ad slots per page on our website and its competitors' websites, assuming the registered users of our website switched between our and competitor's website. We went to the Internet Archive and used an ad blocker to detect how many blocked ads we find on the historical website of our focal publisher and its competitors' websites⁴. Measured by the number of blocked ad slots, we found that our website displayed 5-12 fewer ads per page than its competitors did. This result indicates that our estimates are more likely to understate the actual effect of ad blocker adoption on overall news consumption. In other words, if there was a bias from users switching websites, then we are likely to have erred on the conservative side. Future research could investigate the effect on aggregate news consumption across websites and how competition between websites plays out.

⁴ We define competitors based on Alexa's audience overlap (i.e., websites sharing similar users) and the Top 10 online news brands in the focal country of our news publisher listed by the Digital News Report (Newman et al. 2016).

REFERENCES

Anderson, Ashton, Lucas Maystre, Ian Anderson, Rishabh Mehrotra, and Mounia Lalmas (2020), "Algorithmic Effects on the Diversity of Consumption on Spotify," in Proceedings of The Web Conference 2020.

Angelucci, Charles and Julia Cagé (2019), "Newspapers in Times of Low Advertising Revenues," *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, 11 (3), 319-64.

Angrist, Joshua D and Jörn-Steffen Pischke (2008), *Mostly Harmless Econometrics: An Empiricist's Companion*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Appel, Gil, Barak Libai, Eitan Muller, and Ron Shachar (2020), "On the Monetization of Mobile Apps," *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 37 (1), 93-107.

Aral, Sinan and Paramveer S Dhillon (2021), "Digital Paywall Design: Implications for Content Demand and Subscriptions," *Management Science*, 67 (4), 2381-402.

Aribarg, Anocha and Eric M Schwartz (2019), "Native Advertising in Online News: Trade-Offs among Clicks, Brand Recognition, and Website Trustworthiness," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 57 (1), 20-34.

Aseri, Manmohan, Milind Dawande, Ganesh Janakiraman, and Vijay S. Mookerjee (2020), "Ad-Blockers: A Blessing or a Curse?," *Information Systems Research*, 31 (2), 627-46.

Assael, Henry (2005), "A Demographic and Psychographic Profile of Heavy Internet Users and Users by Type of Internet Usage," *Journal of Advertising Research*, 45 (1), 93-123.

Baddeley, Alan (1992), "Working Memory," *Science*, 255 (5044), 556-59.

Bar-Gill, Sagit, Yael Inbar, and Shachar Reichman (2021), "The Impact of Social Vs. Nonsocial Referring Channels on Online News Consumption," *Management Science*, 67 (4), 2420-47.

Bronnenberg, Bart J, Jean-Pierre Dubé, and Carl F Mela (2010), "Do Digital Video Recorders Influence Sales?," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 47 (6), 998-1010.

Bruce, Norris I., Maren Becker, and Werner Reinartz (2020), "Communicating Brands in Television Advertising," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 57 (2), 236-56.

Cagé, Julia (2020), "Media Competition, Information Provision and Political Participation:

Evidence from French Local Newspapers and Elections, 1944–2014," *Journal of Public Economics*, 185, 104077.

Calzada, Joan and Ricard Gil (2020), "What Do News Aggregators Do? Evidence from Google News in Spain and Germany," *Marketing Science*, 39 (1), 134-67.

Chae, Inyoung, Hernán A Bruno, and Fred M Feinberg (2019), "Wearout or Weariness? Measuring Potential Negative Consequences of Online Ad Volume and Placement on Website Visits," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 56 (1), 57-75.

Chiou, Lesley and Catherine Tucker (2017), "Content Aggregation by Platforms: The Case of the News Media," *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy*, 26 (4), 782-805.

Danaher, Peter J (1995), "What Happens to Television Ratings During Commercial Breaks?," *Journal of Advertising Research*, 35 (1), 37-37.

Danaher, Peter J and Tracey S Dagger (2013), "Comparing the Relative Effectiveness of Advertising Channels: A Case Study of a Multimedia Blitz Campaign," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 50 (4), 517-34.

Datta, Hannes, George Knox, and Bart J Bronnenberg (2018), "Changing Their Tune: How Consumers' Adoption of Online Streaming Affects Music Consumption and Discovery," *Marketing Science*, 37 (1), 5-21.

DeFleur, Melvin L. and Sandra Ball-Rokeach (1989), *Theories of Mass Communication*. New York: Longman.

Despotakis, Stylianos, R Ravi, and Kannan Srinivasan (2021), "The Beneficial Effects of Ad Blockers," *Management Science*, 67 (4), 2096-125.

Dinner, Isaac M, Harald J Van Heerde, and Scott A Neslin (2013), "Driving Online and Offline Sales: The Cross-Channel Effects of Traditional, Online Display, and Paid Search Advertising," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 50 (5), 527-45.

Fan, Ying (2013), "Ownership Consolidation and Product Characteristics: A Study of the Us Daily Newspaper Market," *American Economic Review*, 103 (5), 1598-628.

Goldstein, Daniel G, Siddharth Suri, R Preston McAfee, Matthew Ekstrand-Abueg, and Fernando Diaz (2014), "The Economic and Cognitive Costs of Annoying Display Advertisements," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 51 (6), 742-52.

Gordon, Brett R., Kinshuk Jerath, Zsolt Katona, Sridhar Narayanan, Jiwoong Shin, and

Kenneth C. Wilbur (2020), "Inefficiencies in Digital Advertising Markets," *Journal of Marketing*, 85 (1), 1-19.

Gu, Zhuojun, Ravi Bapna, Jason Chan, and Alok Gupta (2021), "Measuring the Impact of Crowdsourcing Features on Mobile App User Engagement and Retention: A Randomized Field Experiment," *Forthcoming, Management Science*.

Heckman, James, Hidehiko Ichimura, Jeffrey Smith, and Petra Todd (1998), "Characterizing Selection Bias Using Experimental Data," *Econometrica*, 66 (5), 1017-98.

Hoch, Stephen J and John Deighton (1989), "Managing What Consumers Learn from Experience," *Journal of Marketing*, 53 (2), 1-20.

IAB (2015), "Iab Believes Ad Blocking Is Wrong," (accessed October 19, 2020), [available at <https://www.iab.com/blog/iab-believes-ad-blocking-is-wrong/>].

---- (2017), "Iab New Standard Ad Unit Portfolio," Interactive Advertising Bureau.

Iacus, Stefano M, Gary King, and Giuseppe Porro (2012), "Causal Inference without Balance Checking: Coarsened Exact Matching," *Political Analysis*, 20 (1), 1-24.

Johnson, Eric J, Steven Bellman, and Gerald L Lohse (2003), "Cognitive Lock-in and the Power Law of Practice," *Journal of Marketing*, 67 (2), 62-75.

Kahneman, Daniel (1973), *Attention and Effort*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Kaiser, Ulrich and Minjae Song (2009), "Do Media Consumers Really Dislike Advertising? An Empirical Assessment of the Role of Advertising in Print Media Markets," *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 27 (2), 292-301.

Kemp, Simon (2020), "Digital 2020: 3.8 Billion People Use Social Media," (accessed Dec 06, 2020), [available at <https://wearesocial.com/blog/2020/01/digital-2020-3-8-billion-people-use-social-media>].

King, Gary and Richard Nielsen (2019), "Why Propensity Scores Should Not Be Used for Matching," *Political Analysis*, 27 (4), 435-54.

Lambrecht, Anja, Avi Goldfarb, Alessandro Bonatti, Anindya Ghose, Daniel G Goldstein, Randall Lewis, Anita Rao, Navdeep Sahni, and Song Yao (2014), "How Do Firms Make Money Selling Digital Goods Online?," *Marketing Letters*, 25 (3), 331-41.

Lambrecht, Anja and Kanishka Misra (2017), "Fee or Free: When Should Firms Charge

for Online Content?," *Management Science*, 63 (4), 1150-65.

Lambrecht, Anja and Catherine Tucker (2019), "Algorithmic Bias? An Empirical Study of Apparent Gender-Based Discrimination in the Display of Stem Career Ads," *Management Science*, 65 (7), 2966-81.

Lindsay, Matt (2018), "Maximizing Audience Revenue While Minimizing Advertising Loss," (accessed January, 18, 2020), [available at <https://mondaynote.com/maximizing-audience-revenue-while-minimizing-advertising-loss-aa54c9eeecb7>].

Mathur, Arunesh, Jessica Vitak, Arvind Narayanan, and Marshini Chetty (2018), "Characterizing the Use of Browser-Based Blocking Extensions to Prevent Online Tracking," in Fourteenth Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security ({SOUPS} 2018).

Newman, Nic, Richard Fletcher, Antonis Kalogeropoulos, David AL Levy, and Rasmus-Kleis Nielsen (2016), "Digital News Report 2016," in Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism.

Pattabhiramaiah, Adithya, S Sriram, and Shrihari Sridhar (2018), "Rising Prices under Declining Preferences: The Case of the Us Print Newspaper Industry," *Marketing Science*, 37 (1), 97-122.

Roos, Jason M.T., Carl F. Mela, and Ron Shachar (2020), "The Effect of Links and Excerpts on Internet News Consumption," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 57 (3), 395-421.

Rysman, Marc (2004), "Competition between Networks: A Study of the Market for Yellow Pages," *Review of Economic Studies*, 71 (2), 483-512.

Scharkow, Michael, Frank Mangold, Sebastian Stier, and Johannes Breuer (2020), "How Social Network Sites and Other Online Intermediaries Increase Exposure to News," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117 (6), 2761-63.

Schmidt, Ana Lucía, Fabiana Zollo, Michela Del Vicario, Alessandro Bessi, Antonio Scala, Guido Caldarelli, H Eugene Stanley, and Walter Quattrociocchi (2017), "Anatomy of News Consumption on Facebook," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114 (12), 3035-39.

Shiller, Benjamin, Joel Waldfogel, and Johnny Ryan (2018), "The Effect of Ad Blocking on Website Traffic and Quality," *RAND Journal of Economics*, 49 (1), 43-63.

Sołtysik-Piorunkiewicz, Anna, Artur Strzelecki, and Edyta Abramek (2019), "Evaluation of Adblock Software Usage," *Complex Systems Informatics and Modeling Quarterly* (21), 51-

63.

Todri, Vilma (2021), "The Impact of Ad-Blockers on Online Consumer Behavior," *Forthcoming, Marketing Science*

Toulas, Bill (2019), "Axel Springer Group Sues Adblock Plus for Copyright Infringement " (accessed 2021, Jan 12), [available at <https://www.technadu.com/axel-springer-group-sues-adblock-plus-copyright-infringement/64476/>].

Vakratsas, Demetrios and Tim Ambler (1999), "How Advertising Works: What Do We Really Know?," *Journal of Marketing*, 63 (1), 26-43.

Vratonjic, Nevena, Mohammad Hossein Manshaei, Jens Grossklags, and Jean-Pierre Hubaux (2013), "Ad-Blocking Games: Monetizing Online Content under the Threat of Ad Avoidance," in *The Economics of Information Security and Privacy*, Rainer Böhme, ed. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 49-73.

Westcott, Kevin, Jeff Loucks, David Ciampa, and Shashank Srivastava (2019), "Digital Media Trends: A Look Beyond Generations " (accessed July 10, 2021), [available at <https://www2.deloitte.com/us/en/insights/industry/technology/digital-media-trends-consumption-habits-survey/video-streaming-wars-redrawing-battle-lines.html>].

Wilbur, Kenneth C, Linli Xu, and David Kempe (2013), "Correcting Audience Externalities in Television Advertising," *Marketing Science*, 32 (6), 892-912.

Yeon, Michael (2020), "Majority of Adblock Users Pay for Digital Content, and Would Pay Publishers for an Ad-Free Experience," (accessed July 10, 2021), [available at <https://whatsnewinpublishing.com/majority-of-adblock-users-pay-for-digital-content-and-would-pay-publishers-for-an-ad-free-experience/>].

Zervas, Georgios, Davide Proserpio, and John W. Byers (2017), "The Rise of the Sharing Economy: Estimating the Impact of Airbnb on the Hotel Industry," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 54 (5), 687-705.

Zhao, Shuai, Chong Wang, Achir Kalra, Leon Vaks, Cristian Borcea, and Yi Chen (2017), "Ad Blocking and Counter-Ad Blocking: Analysis of Online Ad Blocker Usage," in 2017 Americas Conference on Information Systems.

Table 1. Description of News Consumption and Users' Behavior on the News Website**Panel 1. Summary Statistics of News Consumption Variables**

		Min	Median	Mean	Max	Sd
Main	Article Views	0.00	4.00	9.40	1204.00	17.99
Variables	Breadth	0.00	3.00	3.57	20.00	3.30
Variables	Visits	1.00	4.00	7.72	180.00	9.88
across	Direct Visits	0.00	3.00	7.14	178.00	9.58
Visits	Social Media Visits	0.00	0.00	0.12	149.00	1.37
	Search Engine Visit	0.00	0.00	0.55	117.00	2.70
	Newsletter Visit	0.00	0.00	0.00	19.00	0.10
Variables	Article Views Per Visit	0.00	1.00	1.28	213.00	2.09
within	Other Page Views per Visit	0.00	1.67	2.46	389.30	3.46
Visit	Time per Visit (in seconds)	0.00	259.83	408.31	36163.00	568.76
	Title Length per Visit	1.00	5.50	7.39	572.00	7.13
	Title Length per Article	1.00	4.85	4.90	97.00	1.49

Panel 2. Users' Behavior on the News Website

Category of News Articles	% of Page Views	Category of Non-News Articles	% of Page Views
International Political News	8.35	Homepage	44.17
Economy News	6.44	Account Related	
Sport News	6.22	Page	3.72
Regional Political News	4.79	Weather Forecast	1.82
Finance News	4.03	Search	1.02
Opinion News	3.81	Others	0.56
Outlook News	2.97	Play Page	0.22
Local Political News	2.94	Archive	0.06
Art & Culture News	2.20		
NewsTicker News	1.22		
Sunday News	1.12		
Science News	1.01		
Digital News	0.92		
Lifestyle News	0.81		
Photostream News	0.71		
Transportation News	0.31		
Brief News	0.30		
Video News	0.18		
Special News	0.09		
Data News	0.02		

Notes: All variables are computed at the week-level.

**Table 2. Before-and-After Analysis
of Ad Blocker Adopters and Non-Ad Blocker Adopters**

Variables	Adopters Group Mean			Non Adopters Group Mean			Diff-in-Diff (DiD)
	Pre-Week 12	Post-Week 12	Diff	Pre-Week 12	Post-Week 12	Diff	
	Week 12 Adopters						
Article Views	13.50	14.40	0.90	6.11	5.11	-1.00	1.90
Breadth	4.87	5.34	0.47	2.77	2.52	-0.25	0.72
	Week 13 Adopters						
Article Views	11.60	11.91	0.31	5.99	5.17	-0.82	1.13
Breadth	4.45	4.65	0.20	2.74	2.54	-0.20	0.40
	Week 14 Adopters						
Article Views	10.70	11.20	0.50	5.92	5.12	-0.80	1.30
Breadth	4.21	4.46	0.25	2.71	2.56	-0.15	0.40
	Week 15 Adopters						
Article Views	9.27	11.60	2.33	5.85	5.04	-0.81	3.14
Breadth	3.93	4.42	0.49	2.69	2.67	-0.02	0.51
	All Adopters						
Article Views	11.46	12.35	0.89	6.11	5.11	-1.00	1.89
Breadth	4.41	4.78	0.37	2.77	2.52	-0.25	0.62
Number of Users	6,366			38,290			

Table 3. Comparison of Non-Adopters and Adopters Before and After CEM

Variable	Operationalization	Unmatched Sample		Std. Mean Difference	Matched Sample		Std. Mean Difference
		Control Group Mean	Treatment Group Mean		Control Group Mean	Treatment Group Mean	
Dummy Variables							
Gender	Male=1	0.7748	0.8144	0.1017	0.9425	0.9425	0.0000
Income	Index2=1	0.1005	0.0861	-0.0512	0.0348	0.0348	0.0000
	Index3=1	0.1941	0.2114	0.0424	0.1777	0.1777	0.0000
	Index4=1	0.0849	0.0837	-0.0043	0.0314	0.0314	0.0000
	Index5=1	0.2372	0.2273	-0.0236	0.2631	0.2631	0.0000
	Index6=1	0.3430	0.3411	-0.0039	0.4913	0.4913	0.0000
Age	25-29=1	0.0134	0.0135	0.0005	0.0017	0.0017	0.0000
	30-34=1	0.0232	0.0230	-0.0013	0.0070	0.0070	0.0000
	35-39=1	0.0458	0.0551	0.0409	0.0279	0.0279	0.0000
	40-44=1	0.0857	0.0956	0.0335	0.0732	0.0732	0.0000
	45-49=1	0.1191	0.1369	0.0515	0.1359	0.1359	0.0000
	50-54=1	0.1333	0.1372	0.0116	0.1794	0.1794	0.0000
	55-59=1	0.1253	0.1131	-0.0386	0.1359	0.1359	0.0000
	60-64=1	0.1117	0.1273	0.0470	0.1376	0.1376	0.0000
	65-69=1	0.1116	0.0944	-0.0587	0.1220	0.1220	0.0000
	70-74=1	0.1090	0.0912	-0.0618	0.1237	0.1237	0.0000
First Observed Week	75-79=1	0.0665	0.0559	-0.0462	0.0401	0.0401	0.0000
	80-85=1	0.0467	0.0500	0.0153	0.0157	0.0157	0.0000
	Week1=1	0.2670	0.6022	0.4424	0.6725	0.6725	0.0000
	Week2=1	0.1018	0.0980	-0.0129	0.0871	0.0871	0.0000
	Week3=1	0.0819	0.0682	-0.0543	0.0540	0.0540	0.0000
	Week4=1	0.0928	0.0504	-0.1939	0.0488	0.0488	0.0000
	Week5=1	0.1030	0.0321	-0.4018	0.0314	0.0314	0.0000
	Week6=1	0.0771	0.0393	-0.1946	0.0401	0.0401	0.0000
	Week7=1	0.0620	0.0290	-0.1967	0.0244	0.0244	0.0000
Last Observed Week	Week8=1	0.0519	0.0230	-0.1928	0.0139	0.0139	0.0000
	Week9=1	0.0343	0.0175	-0.1289	0.0087	0.0087	0.0000
	Week13=1	0.0781	0.0210	-0.3978	0.0139	0.0139	0.0000
	Week14=1	0.1016	0.0424	-0.2932	0.0279	0.0279	0.0000
Mode Browser	Week15=1	0.1595	0.0805	-0.2902	0.0575	0.0575	0.0000
	Week16=1	0.4321	0.8497	1.1682	0.9007	0.9007	0.0000
	Apple	0.2988	0.4542	0.3119	0.5052	0.5052	0.0000
	Google	0.1726	0.1449	-0.0787	0.1080	0.1080	0.0000
Mode Browser	Microsoft	0.3644	0.1869	-0.4554	0.2404	0.2404	0.0000
	Mozilla	0.1630	0.2113	0.1183	0.1463	0.1463	0.0000
Continuous Variables							
Article Views		3.4593	9.7247	0.4740	4.8999	5.1617	0.0198
Breadth		1.6897	3.9251	0.8995	2.6966	2.7470	0.0202
Visits		3.5112	9.0920	0.6784	5.2835	5.5516	0.0326
Mobile Page Views		1.1944	4.0732	0.2422	1.2444	1.3641	0.0101
N		11,665	2,499		748	574	

Table 4. Treatment Effect on Article Views, Breadth, and Article Views in Each News Category

Panel 1. Treatment Effect on Article Views and Breadth

	Ad Blocker Adoption		Ad Blocker Early Adoption		Ad Blocker Abandonment	
	Article Views	Breadth	Article Views	Breadth	Article Views	Breadth
β_1	0.297*** (0.038)	0.198*** (0.027)	0.322* (0.127)	0.207* (0.082)	-0.230 (0.119)	-0.135 (0.082)
β_2	0.155** (0.049)	0.096** (0.036)	-0.010 (0.133)	0.019 (0.086)	0.109 (0.154)	0.067 (0.101)
N	9,370	9,370	1,423	1,423	1,009	1,009
R ²	0.503	0.491	0.462	0.423	0.560	0.550

Panel 2. Treatment Effect on Article Views in Each News Category

	Hard News			Soft News			Non-News Article Pages		
	Political	Economic	Opinion	Sports	Art Culture & Lifestyle	Weather	Play Page	Account	
β_1	0.234*** (0.037)	0.145*** (0.027)	0.085*** (0.022)	0.120*** (0.028)	0.061*** (0.018)	0.015 (0.011)	0.016 (0.015)	0.002 (0.005)	0.006 (0.022)
β_2	0.125** (0.046)	0.088** (0.031)	0.056* (0.027)	0.034 (0.030)	0.030 (0.022)	0.013 (0.014)	0.012 (0.018)	0.001 (0.008)	0.000 (0.030)
N	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370
R ²	0.518	0.437	0.346	0.594	0.348	0.314	0.709	0.759	0.332

Notes: In both panels, β_1 represents the 1-week effect and β_2 represents the 5-week effect. Each column refers to a separate regression of the following model: $\log(Y_{it} + 1) = \alpha_i + \delta_t + \beta_1 * I_{it1}(\text{within 1 week of Treatment}_{it}) + \beta_2 * I_{it2}(\text{remaining weeks since Treatment}_{it}) + \varepsilon_{it}$ on a matched sample centered around 5 weeks (at maximum) before and after treatment starts on week 12. R² computation includes the explanatory power of the fixed effects. Clustered standard errors appear in parentheses. ***p < 0.001, **p < 0.01, *p < 0.05. In Panel 2, β_1 for Political, Economics, Opinion, and Sports news stay significant (p < 0.001) and β_2 for Political and Economic news stay weakly significant (p < 0.1) under the Bonferroni correction of p-values.

Table 5. Treatment Effects on Within- and Across-Visit Measurements**Panel 1. Effects within a Visit (Compatible with a Cognitive Mechanism)**

	Article Views per Visits	Other Page Views per Visits	Title Length per Visit	Title Length per Article	Time per Visit
β_1	0.067*** (0.017)	0.047** (0.017)	0.146*** (0.034)	0.018 (0.013)	0.387*** (0.077)
β_2	0.029 (0.021)	0.024 (0.021)	0.055 (0.044)	-0.012 (0.018)	0.217* (0.109)
N	9,370	9,370	9,370	8,037	9,370
R ²	0.451	0.464	0.358	0.305	0.358

Panel 2. Effect across Visits (Compatible with a Learning Mechanism)

	Visits	Direct Visits	Social Media Visits	Search Engine Visits	Newsletter Visits
β_1	0.209*** (0.025)	0.208*** (0.027)	-0.004 (0.008)	0.039* (0.017)	0.001 (0.001)
β_2	0.118*** (0.033)	0.112** (0.035)	0.008 (0.012)	0.036 (0.021)	-0.000 (0.001)
N	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370
R ²	0.627	0.662	0.567	0.551	0.167

Notes: β_1 represents the 1-week effect and β_2 represents the 5-week effect. Each column refers to a separate regression of the following model: $\log(Y_{it} + 1) = \alpha_i + \delta_t + \beta_1 * I_{it1}(\text{within 1 week of Treatment}_{it}) + \beta_2 * I_{it2}(\text{remaining weeks since Treatment}_{it}) + \varepsilon_{it}$ on a matched sample centered around 5 weeks (at maximum) before and after treatment starts on week 12. R² computation includes the explanatory power of the fixed effects. Clustered standard errors appear in parentheses. ***p < 0.001, **p < 0.01, *p < 0.05. Under the Bonferroni correction of p-values, Article Views per Visits, Title Length per Visit, Time per Visit, Visits and Direct Visits stay significant (p < 0.001).

**Table 6. Heterogeneous Treatment Effects
across Users with Different Characteristics**

Panel 1. Single-Browser Users vs. Multiple-Browser Users


	Single Browser		Multiple Browsers	
	Article Views	Breadth	Article Views	Breadth
β_1	0.341*** (0.065)	0.219*** (0.046)	0.269*** (0.048)	0.181*** (0.034)
β_2	0.160* (0.076)	0.091 (0.054)	0.144* (0.064)	0.090 (0.047)
N	3,504	3,504	5,866	5,866
R ²	0.562	0.564	0.452	0.427

Panel 2. Light Users vs. Heavy Users

	Light Users		Heavy Users	
	Article Views	Breadth	Article Views	Breadth
β_1	0.333*** (0.056)	0.211*** (0.040)	0.262*** (0.052)	0.183*** (0.037)
β_2	0.193** (0.064)	0.135** (0.048)	0.126 (0.071)	0.066 (0.051)
N	4,684	4,684	4,686	4,686
R ²	0.434	0.432	0.445	0.404

Notes: Each column refers to a separate regression of the following model: $\log(Y_{it} + 1) = \alpha_i + \delta_t + \beta_1 * I_{it1}(\text{within 1 week of Treatment}_{it}) + \beta_2 * I_{it2}(\text{remaining weeks since Treatment}_{it}) + \varepsilon_{it}$ on the matched subsample. Single-browsers users refer to registered users who keep using the same browser to visit our website. Light users refer to registered users who visit our website less than median in the pre-treatment period. R² computation includes the explanatory power of the fixed effects. Clustered standard errors appear in parentheses. ***p < 0.001, **p < 0.01, *p < 0.05.

Figure 1. Comparison of a News Website without and with an Ad Blocker



Source: Screenshots from *ft.com*

Figure 2. Construction of Treatment Groups and Control Groups





Figure 3. Distribution of Propensity Score in Matched and Raw Sample

Web Appendix A. Placebo Treatment Test for Parallel Pre-Treatment Trend

The identification assumption under difference-in-differences (DiD) is that in the absence of the treatment (i.e., the ad blocker adoption), there would have been no differential changes in the news consumption between the treatment and control group. This assumption also means that we should have comparable changes in the news consumption between both groups before the treatment. The condition fulfilling this assumption is that we have parallel pre-treatment trends. To formally test this parallel pre-treatment trends condition, we perform a “placebo” treatment test by estimating the week-wise treatment effects before and after the treatment. Specifically, we replace the I_{it1} and I_{it2} in equation (1) in the main manuscript for each user i with a set of week-wise dummy variables $I_{it-\tau}$ that are equal to 1 if week t is τ weeks before the treatment and another set of dummy variables $I_{it+\tau}$ that are equal to 1 if week t is τ weeks after the treatment (and that are equal to zero otherwise):

$$(2) \quad Y_{it} = \alpha_i + \delta_t + \sum_{\tau=2}^{\tau=5} \beta_{-\tau} * I_{it-\tau}(\tau \text{ weeks before Treatment}_{it}) + \sum_{\tau=0}^{\tau=4} \beta_{\tau} * I_{it+\tau}(\tau \text{ weeks since Treatment}_{it}) + \varepsilon_{it},$$

where Y_{it} is the news consumption for user i in week t ; α_i is a user-level fixed effect; δ_t is the week-fixed effect; ε_{it} is the standard error clustered at the user-level. We choose the last week before treatment (I_{it-1}) as the omitted default category. If the trends of the treatment and control group are parallel, then the parameters $\beta_{-\tau}$ will be statistically indistinguishable from zero. As reported in Table S1, all the main news consumption measures we use pass this test because the parameters $\beta_{-\tau}$ in the pre-treatment period have non-significant point estimates.

Table S1. Placebo Treatment Test on News Consumption Variables

	Article Views	Breadth	Visits	Article Views per Visit	International Political News	Regional Political News	Local Political News	Economy News
β_{-2}	-0.054 (0.042)	-0.065 (0.031)	-0.023 (0.028)	-0.029 (0.022)	0.007 (0.030)	-0.029 (0.030)	-0.012 (0.027)	-0.003 (0.027)
β_{-3}	-0.010 (0.047)	-0.037 (0.035)	0.037 (0.030)	-0.023 (0.023)	0.054 (0.034)	-0.007 (0.031)	0.006 (0.028)	-0.016 (0.031)
β_{-4}	-0.014 (0.049)	-0.039 (0.036)	0.018 (0.032)	-0.013 (0.024)	-0.018 (0.032)	-0.004 (0.032)	0.005 (0.027)	-0.010 (0.033)
β_{-5}	-0.048 (0.047)	-0.054 (0.035)	-0.039 (0.035)	0.004 (0.024)	-0.015 (0.032)	-0.060 (0.033)	-0.016 (0.027)	-0.038 (0.030)
R ²	0.505	0.492	0.628	0.452	0.487	0.455	0.426	0.438
N	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370
	Finance News	Opinion News	Sport News	Art & Culture News	Lifestyle News	Weather Forecast	Play Page	Account
β_{-2}	-0.016 (0.029)	-0.001 (0.027)	-0.013 (0.029)	-0.009 (0.018)	0.001 (0.015)	0.020 (0.017)	-0.004 (0.004)	0.011 (0.027)
β_{-3}	-0.013 (0.030)	-0.007 (0.029)	0.064 (0.030)	-0.017 (0.021)	0.019 (0.018)	0.007 (0.022)	-0.000 (0.004)	0.022 (0.028)
β_{-4}	-0.030 (0.029)	-0.002 (0.030)	0.019 (0.029)	0.001 (0.021)	-0.023 (0.017)	-0.023 (0.021)	-0.001 (0.004)	0.035 (0.032)
β_{-5}	-0.064 (0.029)	-0.004 (0.030)	0.002 (0.030)	0.005 (0.022)	-0.028 (0.014)	-0.002 (0.020)	-0.002 (0.005)	-0.021 (0.027)
R ²	0.575	0.347	0.595	0.348	0.315	0.709	0.759	0.332
N	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370
	Home Page Views per Visit	Words per Article	Words per Sentence	Time per Visit	Direct Visits	Social Media Visits	Search Engine Visits	Newsletter Visits
β_{-2}	-0.018 (0.017)	-0.061 (0.051)	-0.004 (0.008)	-0.121 (0.110)	-0.029 (0.030)	-0.002 (0.008)	0.016 (0.021)	0.000 (0.000)
β_{-3}	-0.004 (0.017)	-0.011 (0.052)	-0.003 (0.009)	-0.044 (0.114)	0.042 (0.031)	0.010 (0.009)	0.008 (0.023)	0.001 (0.001)
β_{-4}	0.029 (0.019)	-0.045 (0.056)	-0.004 (0.008)	0.107 (0.116)	0.026 (0.034)	0.003 (0.009)	-0.013 (0.023)	0.001 (0.000)
β_{-5}	0.012 (0.019)	0.013 (0.049)	-0.009 (0.010)	-0.023 (0.119)	-0.022 (0.036)	0.004 (0.007)	-0.040 (0.021)	0.000 (0.000)
R ²	0.514	0.364	0.248	0.360	0.662	0.568	0.551	0.167
N	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370

Notes: Each column refers to a separate regression with the following model: $\log(Y_{it} + 1) = \alpha_i + \delta_t + \sum_{\tau=2}^5 \beta_{-\tau} * I_{it-\tau}(\tau \text{ weeks before Treatment}_{it}) + \sum_{\tau=0}^4 \beta_{\tau} * I_{it+\tau}(\tau \text{ weeks since Treatment}_{it}) + \varepsilon_{it}$ on the matched sample of ad blocker adopters and non-adopters. $\beta_{-\tau}$ are the placebo treatment effects and are reported with β_{-1} omitted as the default category. R² computation includes the explanatory power of the fixed effects. Standard errors clustered at the user-level appear in parentheses. *p < 0.01.

Web Appendix B. Robustness Check on Adding Time-Varying Controls

The placebo treatment test (reported in Table S1) statistically validates the identification condition (parallel pre-treatment trend) of DiD. Recall that DiD removes all time-invariant confounders. If the parallel pre-treatment trend holds, then DiD will also eliminate any bias from time-varying confounders. The reason is that a common pre-treatment trend implies that time-varying confounders, if any, impact both groups (i.e., treatment and control group) in the same way in the pre-treatment period.

Concerns may remain that a time-varying confounder kicks in at the same time when the treatment occurs and, thus, will bias our result. For example, a user reads news on a browser with no ad-blocking feature. Then, the user installs an additional more user-friendly browser with an ad-blocking feature and, at the same time, starts reading the news with multiple browsers. So, this installation of a browser changes her ad blocker usage, and the more user-friendly browser also impacts her news reading behavior.

To further establish the robustness of our main result, we rerun our main estimation by adding the following time-varying control variables: browser switching (i.e., the number of different browsers that a user uses during a particular week), ordering (i.e., the number of orders that a user places on the website during a particular week, such as purchasing access to the news archive), and commenting (i.e., the number of comments that a user leaves during a particular week).

Specifically, we estimate the following model

$$(3) \quad Y_{it} = \alpha_i + \delta_t + \beta_1 * I_{it1}(\text{within 1 week of Treatment}_{it}) \\ + \beta_2 * I_{it2}(\text{remaining weeks since Treatment}_{it}) + \beta_3 * Browsers_{it} + \beta_4 * Orders_{it} \\ + \beta_5 * Comments_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$$

Table S2 reports the result that our main treatment effects (β_1 and β_2) remain very robust because they are similar to the treatment effects reported in Table 4. For brevity, we continue and only report results for news categories classified into the following: hard news (political, economic and opinion news) and soft news (sports, culture & art, lifestyle news).

Table S2. Robustness Check of Main Model after also Controlling for Browser Switching, Ordering, & Commenting

	Article Views	Breadth	Visits	Article Views per Visit	Hard News	Soft News
β_1	0.255*** (0.037)	0.170*** (0.026)	0.169*** (0.024)	0.065*** (0.017)	0.244*** (0.038)	0.133*** (0.031)
β_2	0.119* (0.047)	0.071* (0.035)	0.086** (0.032)	0.026 (0.021)	0.143** (0.048)	0.028 (0.035)
β_3 ($Browsers_{it}$)	0.373*** (0.023)	0.250*** (0.018)	0.342*** (0.016)	0.024* (0.010)	0.335*** (0.023)	0.161*** (0.019)
β_4 ($Orders_{it}$)	-0.291 (0.286)	-0.352* (0.150)	-0.040 (0.151)	-0.218 (0.130)	-0.208 (0.239)	-0.115 (0.143)
β_5 ($Comments_{it}$)	-0.035 (0.032)	-0.012 (0.024)	0.032 (0.017)	-0.049** (0.016)	-0.003 (0.034)	0.028 (0.030)
N	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370
R ²	0.529	0.514	0.663	0.453	0.558	0.548

Notes: β_1 represents the 1-week effect and β_2 represents the 5-week effect. *** p < 0.001, ** p < 0.01, * p < 0.05. Each column refers to a separate regression of the following model on the matched sample of ad blocker adopters and non-adopters:

$\log(Y_{it} + 1) = \alpha_i + \delta_t + \beta_1 * I_{it1}(\text{within 1 week of Treatment}_{it}) + \beta_2 * I_{it2}(\text{remaining weeks since Treatment}_{it}) + \beta_3 * Browsers_{it} + \beta_4 * Orders_{it} + \beta_5 * Comments_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$. R² computation includes the explanatory power of the fixed effects. Standard errors clustered at the user-level appear in parentheses.

Web Appendix C. Robustness Checks on Matching Method

In this section, we check for the robustness of the results of our matching method and, in particular, of the coarsened exact matching (CEM) method.

First, we check for the robustness of our result by running specification (1) from the main manuscript using the unmatched sample. The results are reported in Table S3 and remain similar.

Second, we run specification (4) to check for the robustness of missing observations due to matching on demographics (i.e., age, gender, income). The demographics data came from the customer relationship dataset (CRM) of the news publisher. For the demographic values that are missing, which could result from a user deliberately not reporting that value or a coding error, we add the interaction (i.e., I_{it2} in specification (4)) between the missing value and our main effect. We report the results in Table S4. The coefficients (β_3 and β_4) of the interaction terms are statistically insignificant, which indicates that these missing values occur at random (and, therefore, do not induce bias in the estimation). In addition, our main effect remains similar.

$$(4) \quad Y_{it} = \alpha_i + \delta_t + \beta_1 * I_{it1}(\text{within 1 week of Treatment}_{it}) + \beta_2 * I_{it2}(\text{remaining weeks since Treatment}_{it}) + \beta_3 * I_{it1}(\text{within 1 week of Treatment}_{it}) * \text{Missing}_i + \beta_4 * I_{it2}(\text{remaining weeks since Treatment}_{it}) * \text{Missing}_i + \varepsilon_{it}.$$

Third, we check for the robustness of controlling for observed variables (rather than using them in the matching; see Table 3 or Table S5 for the list of these variables). In addition, we add an interaction between the week-fixed effect and the browser mode in the pre-treatment period because we know that the Apple iOS 9 event triggered ad blocker adoption and, thus, users with different browsers might experience different time trends. We run the specification (5) and report the results in Table S5. Our main effects again remain similar.

$$(5) \quad Y_{it} = \beta_1 * I_{it1}(\text{within 1 week of Treatment}_{it}) + \beta_2 * I_{it2}(\text{remaining weeks since Treatment}_{it}) + \sum_{\tau=1}^{\tau=n} \gamma_{\tau} * \text{MatchingVariables}_{it\tau} + \delta_t + \eta_{it} * (\delta_t * \text{ModeBrowser}_i) + \varepsilon_{it}$$

Forth, we check for the robustness of the results of coarsened exact matching. We rerun specification (1) of the main manuscript on the sample matched using propensity score matching. The results (reported in Table S6) continue to remain similar.

Table S3. Robustness Check on Unmatched Sample

	Article Views	Breadth	Visits	Article Views per Visit	Hard News	Soft News
β_1	0.260*** (0.009)	0.159*** (0.006)	0.231*** (0.007)	0.032*** (0.004)	0.229*** (0.010)	0.185*** (0.008)
β_2	0.110*** (0.012)	0.067*** (0.007)	0.122*** (0.008)	0.002 (0.005)	0.120*** (0.012)	0.122*** (0.009)
N	252,428	252,428	252,428	252,428	252,428	252,428
R ²	0.631	0.624	0.685	0.541	0.633	0.606

Notes: β_1 represents the 1-week effect and β_2 represents the 5-week effect. Each column refers to a separate regression of the following model on the unmatched sample: $\log(Y_{it} + 1) = \alpha_i + \delta_t + \beta_1 * I_{it1}(\text{within 1 week of Treatment}_{it}) + \beta_2 * I_{it2}(\text{remaining weeks since Treatment}_{it}) + \varepsilon_{it}$. R² computation includes the explanatory power of the fixed effects. Standard errors clustered at the user-level appear in parentheses. ***p < 0.001, **p < 0.01, *p < 0.05.

Table S4. Robustness Check on Missing Observations in Demographics

	Article Views	Breadth	Visits	Article Views per Visit	Hard News	Soft News
β_1	0.245*** (0.015)	0.151*** (0.010)	0.212*** (0.010)	0.036*** (0.007)	0.216*** (0.015)	0.198*** (0.013)
β_2	0.088*** (0.017)	0.052*** (0.012)	0.096*** (0.013)	0.007 (0.008)	0.119*** (0.018)	0.115*** (0.015)
β_3	0.010 (0.022)	-0.008 (0.014)	0.006 (0.015)	-0.001 (0.010)	0.023 (0.022)	-0.031 (0.019)
β_4	0.026 (0.025)	0.001 (0.016)	0.027 (0.018)	-0.002 (0.010)	0.012 (0.026)	0.007 (0.021)
N	118,696	118,696	118,696	118,696	118,696	118,696
R ²	0.679	0.668	0.745	0.562	0.676	0.636

Notes: Each column refers to a separate regression of the following model on the unmatched sample: $\log(Y_{it} + 1) = \alpha_i + \delta_t + \beta_1 * I_{it1}(\text{within 1 week of Treatment}_{it}) + \beta_2 * I_{it2}(\text{remaining weeks since Treatment}_{it}) + \beta_3 * I_{it1}(\text{within 1 week of Treatment}_{it}) * \text{Missing}_i + \beta_4 * I_{it2}(\text{remaining weeks since Treatment}_{it} \text{ for treated} * \text{Missing}_i) + \varepsilon_{it}$. β_1 represents the 5-week effect, and β_2 represents the interaction effect of the 5-week effect and any missing observations (e.g., due to users not revealing full information in our CRM data). Insignificant β_2 indicates matching does not induce bias in the estimation. R² computation includes the explanatory power of the fixed effects. Standard errors clustered at the user-level appear in parentheses. ***p < 0.001, **p < 0.01, *p < 0.05.

**Table S5. Robustness Check on Controlling for Observed Variables
(Instead of Using Matching Method)**

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables					
	Article Views	Breadth	Visits	Article Views per Visit	Hard News	Soft News
(Intercept)	-0.277 (0.226)	-0.148 (0.161)	0.481** (0.159)	0.091 (0.129)	-0.224 (0.231)	-0.552* (0.215)
I_{it1}	0.302*** (0.013)	0.196*** (0.009)	0.290*** (0.009)	0.042*** (0.007)	0.227*** (0.013)	0.206*** (0.012)
I_{it2}	0.175*** (0.014)	0.127*** (0.010)	0.239*** (0.010)	-0.004 (0.008)	0.157*** (0.014)	0.140*** (0.013)
Gender	-0.007 (0.007)	0.009 (0.005)	0.016** (0.005)	-0.016*** (0.004)	-0.021** (0.007)	-0.004 (0.007)
Income2	0.015 (0.017)	-0.018 (0.012)	-0.007 (0.012)	0.006 (0.010)	-0.012 (0.017)	0.034* (0.016)
Income3	0.040* (0.016)	0.006 (0.011)	0.011 (0.011)	0.007 (0.009)	0.014 (0.016)	0.027 (0.015)
Income4	0.006 (0.017)	-0.010 (0.012)	0.002 (0.012)	-0.009 (0.010)	0.003 (0.018)	-0.005 (0.016)
Income5	0.018 (0.016)	-0.003 (0.011)	0.010 (0.011)	-0.002 (0.009)	-0.008 (0.016)	0.013 (0.015)
Income6	0.028 (0.015)	0.000 (0.011)	0.004 (0.011)	0.004 (0.009)	0.010 (0.016)	-0.007 (0.015)
Age25-29	0.051 (0.041)	0.045 (0.029)	0.024 (0.029)	0.018 (0.023)	0.070 (0.042)	0.030 (0.039)
Age30-34	0.009 (0.038)	-0.004 (0.027)	0.013 (0.027)	-0.012 (0.022)	0.021 (0.039)	-0.038 (0.036)
Age35-39	0.015 (0.035)	0.030 (0.025)	0.020 (0.025)	-0.019 (0.020)	0.045 (0.036)	-0.103** (0.033)
Age40-44	0.008 (0.034)	0.014 (0.024)	0.030 (0.024)	-0.034 (0.019)	-0.000 (0.035)	-0.010 (0.032)
Age45-49	-0.014 (0.033)	0.016 (0.024)	0.028 (0.023)	-0.031 (0.019)	-0.017 (0.034)	0.001 (0.032)
Age50-54	-0.033 (0.033)	-0.006 (0.024)	0.006 (0.023)	-0.033 (0.019)	-0.027 (0.034)	-0.010 (0.032)
Age55-59	-0.014 (0.033)	0.008 (0.024)	0.013 (0.024)	-0.022 (0.019)	-0.014 (0.034)	0.034 (0.032)
Age60-64	-0.039 (0.034)	-0.012 (0.024)	0.003 (0.024)	-0.035 (0.019)	-0.017 (0.034)	0.020 (0.032)
Age65-69	-0.025 (0.034)	-0.012 (0.024)	-0.008 (0.024)	-0.020 (0.019)	0.002 (0.034)	0.033 (0.032)
Age70-74	-0.028 (0.034)	-0.010 (0.024)	-0.009 (0.024)	-0.023 (0.019)	0.020 (0.034)	0.001 (0.032)
Age75-79	0.003 (0.034)	0.006 (0.024)	0.020 (0.024)	-0.021 (0.020)	0.029 (0.035)	0.038 (0.033)
Age80-84	0.034 (0.035)	0.031 (0.025)	0.048 (0.025)	-0.023 (0.020)	0.079* (0.036)	0.026 (0.033)
Pre-ArticleViews	0.006*** (0.000)	-0.005*** (0.000)	- (0.000)	0.008*** (0.000)	0.004*** (0.000)	0.004*** (0.000)
Pre-Breadth	0.254***	0.218***	0.053***	0.121***	0.245***	0.113***

Dependent Variables	Article Views	Breadth	Visits	Article Views per Visit	Hard News	Soft News
Independent Variables						
	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Pre-Visits	0.001*	-0.002***	0.069***	-0.036***	0.000	0.005***
	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Firstweek1	0.172***	0.133***	0.090***	0.083***	0.085***	0.045*
	(0.020)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.011)	(0.020)	(0.019)
Firstweek2	0.122***	0.095***	0.018	0.097***	0.058**	-0.018
	(0.021)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.012)	(0.021)	(0.020)
Firstweek3	0.072***	0.065***	-0.011	0.088***	0.018	-0.041*
	(0.021)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.012)	(0.022)	(0.020)
Firstweek4	0.055*	0.041**	-0.029	0.076***	0.018	-0.027
	(0.022)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.012)	(0.022)	(0.020)
Firstweek5	0.041	0.024	-0.022	0.062***	0.004	-0.020
	(0.022)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.012)	(0.022)	(0.021)
Firstweek6	0.079***	0.059***	-0.027	0.097***	0.052*	-0.009
	(0.022)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.013)	(0.023)	(0.021)
Firstweek7	0.028	0.012	-0.023	0.057***	0.015	-0.012
	(0.022)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.013)	(0.023)	(0.021)
Firstweek8	0.038	0.033*	-0.011	0.056***	0.009	-0.016
	(0.023)	(0.017)	(0.016)	(0.013)	(0.024)	(0.022)
Firstweek9	0.031	0.014	-0.051**	0.067***	-0.016	-0.004
	(0.027)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.015)	(0.027)	(0.025)
Firstweek10	0.053*	0.033	-0.024	0.052***	0.040	-0.009
	(0.026)	(0.019)	(0.018)	(0.015)	(0.027)	(0.025)
Lastweek11	0.060*	0.034	-0.003	0.041*	0.033	0.017
	(0.028)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.016)	(0.029)	(0.027)
Lastweek12	0.058*	0.043*	-0.009	0.058***	0.018	0.012
	(0.027)	(0.020)	(0.019)	(0.016)	(0.028)	(0.026)
Lastweek13	0.090***	0.074***	0.007	0.077***	0.031	0.017
	(0.026)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.015)	(0.026)	(0.024)
Lastweek14	0.123***	0.100***	0.015	0.105***	0.040	0.029
	(0.024)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.014)	(0.025)	(0.023)
Lastweek15	0.172***	0.150***	0.085***	0.114***	0.055*	0.031
	(0.023)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.013)	(0.023)	(0.022)
Lastweek16	0.330***	0.260***	0.288***	0.119***	0.182***	0.066**
	(0.022)	(0.016)	(0.015)	(0.012)	(0.022)	(0.021)
Pre-Mobile Page Views	0.011***	0.005***	0.007***	0.002***	0.011***	0.009***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Week8	0.195	0.106	-0.061	0.216	0.112	-0.117
	(0.342)	(0.243)	(0.241)	(0.195)	(0.349)	(0.325)
Week9	0.051	0.199	-0.096	0.181	0.091	-0.021
	(0.342)	(0.243)	(0.240)	(0.195)	(0.349)	(0.325)
Week10	0.445	0.377	0.129	0.283	0.133	0.342
	(0.302)	(0.214)	(0.212)	(0.172)	(0.308)	(0.286)
Week11	0.429	0.368	0.091	0.251	0.324	0.314
	(0.308)	(0.218)	(0.216)	(0.175)	(0.314)	(0.292)
Week12	0.435	0.469*	0.292	0.164	0.267	0.277
	(0.322)	(0.229)	(0.226)	(0.183)	(0.328)	(0.305)
Week13	0.838*	0.513*	0.181	0.487**	0.735*	0.334
	(0.331)	(0.235)	(0.233)	(0.188)	(0.338)	(0.314)

Dependent Variables	Article Views	Breadth	Visits	Article Views per Visit	Hard News	Soft News
Independent Variables						
Week14	0.576 (0.314)	0.322 (0.223)	0.243 (0.221)	0.203 (0.179)	0.466 (0.321)	0.479 (0.298)
Week15	0.399 (0.322)	0.230 (0.229)	-0.093 (0.226)	0.397* (0.183)	0.378 (0.329)	0.233 (0.305)
Week16	0.329 (0.322)	0.023 (0.229)	-0.078 (0.226)	0.280 (0.183)	0.525 (0.329)	0.180 (0.305)
ModeBrowserApple	0.429 (0.223)	0.331* (0.158)	0.238 (0.157)	0.179 (0.127)	0.263 (0.227)	0.537* (0.211)
ModeBrowserGoogle	0.338 (0.224)	0.263 (0.159)	0.243 (0.157)	0.110 (0.127)	0.236 (0.228)	0.418* (0.212)
ModeBrowserMicrosoft	0.493* (0.223)	0.335* (0.158)	0.315* (0.157)	0.183 (0.127)	0.329 (0.227)	0.487* (0.211)
ModeBrowserMozilla	0.439* (0.224)	0.318* (0.159)	0.324* (0.157)	0.124 (0.127)	0.300 (0.228)	0.526* (0.212)
Week8*ModeBrowserApple	-0.149 (0.343)	-0.069 (0.244)	0.066 (0.241)	-0.194 (0.195)	-0.038 (0.350)	0.118 (0.325)
Week9*ModeBrowserApple	-0.045 (0.343)	-0.203 (0.244)	0.057 (0.241)	-0.156 (0.195)	-0.066 (0.350)	0.012 (0.325)
Week10*ModeBrowserApple	-0.428 (0.303)	-0.360 (0.215)	-0.166 (0.213)	-0.256 (0.172)	-0.152 (0.309)	-0.297 (0.287)
Week11*ModeBrowserApple	-0.451 (0.308)	-0.372 (0.219)	-0.128 (0.217)	-0.246 (0.175)	-0.374 (0.315)	-0.297 (0.292)
Week12*ModeBrowserApple	-0.396 (0.323)	-0.434 (0.229)	-0.291 (0.227)	-0.150 (0.184)	-0.252 (0.329)	-0.243 (0.306)
Week13*ModeBrowserApple	-0.883** (0.332)	-0.549* (0.236)	-0.220 (0.233)	-0.503** (0.189)	-0.782* (0.339)	-0.268 (0.315)
Week14*ModeBrowserApple	-0.572 (0.315)	-0.353 (0.224)	-0.283 (0.221)	-0.192 (0.179)	-0.491 (0.321)	-0.364 (0.299)
Week15*ModeBrowserApple	-0.402 (0.323)	-0.260 (0.229)	0.067 (0.227)	-0.399* (0.184)	-0.360 (0.329)	-0.157 (0.306)
Week16*ModeBrowserApple	-0.420 (0.323)	-0.039 (0.229)	-0.090 (0.227)	-0.261 (0.184)	-0.485 (0.329)	-0.134 (0.306)
Week8*ModeBrowserGoogle	-0.169 (0.344)	-0.088 (0.244)	0.078 (0.242)	-0.214 (0.196)	-0.103 (0.351)	0.149 (0.326)
Week9*ModeBrowserGoogle	0.079 (0.344)	-0.094 (0.244)	0.083 (0.242)	-0.082 (0.196)	0.035 (0.351)	0.069 (0.326)
Week10*ModeBrowserGoogle	-0.259 (0.303)	-0.223 (0.215)	-0.116 (0.213)	-0.163 (0.173)	0.010 (0.310)	-0.222 (0.288)
Week11*ModeBrowserGoogle	-0.313 (0.309)	-0.263 (0.219)	-0.098 (0.217)	-0.168 (0.176)	-0.260 (0.315)	-0.216 (0.293)
Week12*ModeBrowserGoogle	-0.300 (0.323)	-0.342 (0.230)	-0.298 (0.227)	-0.071 (0.184)	-0.159 (0.330)	-0.188 (0.307)
Week13*ModeBrowserGoogle	-0.696* (0.333)	-0.409 (0.236)	-0.171 (0.234)	-0.398* (0.189)	-0.612 (0.339)	-0.182 (0.316)
Week14*ModeBrowserGoogle	-0.408 (0.316)	-0.240 (0.224)	-0.270 (0.222)	-0.083 (0.180)	-0.337 (0.322)	-0.287 (0.299)
Week15*ModeBrowserGoogle	-0.269 (0.323)	-0.173 (0.230)	0.089 (0.227)	-0.315 (0.184)	-0.240 (0.330)	-0.096 (0.307)
Week16*ModeBrowserGoogle	-0.240	0.076	-0.038	-0.162	-0.338	0.007

Dependent Variables	Article Views	Breadth	Visits	Article Views per Visit	Hard News	Soft News
Independent Variables						
	(0.323)	(0.230)	(0.227)	(0.184)	(0.330)	(0.307)
Week8*ModeBrowserMicrosoft	-0.148	-0.079	0.064	-0.194	-0.080	0.112
	(0.343)	(0.244)	(0.241)	(0.195)	(0.350)	(0.325)
Week9*ModeBrowserMicrosoft	-0.108	-0.175	0.042	-0.191	-0.071	0.053
	(0.343)	(0.244)	(0.241)	(0.195)	(0.350)	(0.325)
Week10*ModeBrowserMicrosoft	-0.460	-0.335	-0.175	-0.284	-0.110	-0.240
	(0.303)	(0.215)	(0.213)	(0.172)	(0.309)	(0.287)
Week11*ModeBrowserMicrosoft	-0.462	-0.332	-0.137	-0.260	-0.319	-0.237
	(0.308)	(0.219)	(0.217)	(0.175)	(0.315)	(0.292)
Week12*ModeBrowserMicrosoft	-0.450	-0.418	-0.316	-0.169	-0.244	-0.218
	(0.323)	(0.229)	(0.227)	(0.184)	(0.329)	(0.306)
Week13*ModeBrowserMicrosoft	-0.899**	-0.491*	-0.245	-0.500**	-0.696*	-0.254
	(0.332)	(0.236)	(0.233)	(0.189)	(0.339)	(0.315)
Week14*ModeBrowserMicrosoft	-0.610	-0.309	-0.302	-0.203	-0.441	-0.327
	(0.315)	(0.224)	(0.221)	(0.179)	(0.321)	(0.299)
Week15*ModeBrowserMicrosoft	-0.435	-0.237	0.056	-0.417*	-0.320	-0.122
	(0.323)	(0.229)	(0.227)	(0.184)	(0.329)	(0.306)
Week16*ModeBrowserMicrosoft	-0.439	-0.011	-0.101	-0.276	-0.456	-0.060
	(0.323)	(0.229)	(0.227)	(0.184)	(0.329)	(0.306)
Week8*ModeBrowserMozilla	-0.183	-0.110	0.033	-0.190	-0.085	0.101
	(0.344)	(0.244)	(0.242)	(0.196)	(0.351)	(0.326)
Week9*BrowsertypeMozilla	-0.076	-0.192	-0.023	-0.108	-0.065	0.003
	(0.344)	(0.244)	(0.242)	(0.196)	(0.351)	(0.326)
Week10:BrowsertypeMozilla	-0.437	-0.347	-0.224	-0.217	-0.131	-0.322
	(0.304)	(0.216)	(0.213)	(0.173)	(0.310)	(0.288)
Week11*ModeBrowserMozilla	-0.442	-0.349	-0.192	-0.194	-0.351	-0.299
	(0.309)	(0.220)	(0.217)	(0.176)	(0.315)	(0.293)
Week12*ModeBrowserMozilla	-0.429	-0.413	-0.390	-0.089	-0.216	-0.266
	(0.324)	(0.230)	(0.227)	(0.184)	(0.330)	(0.307)
Week13*ModeBrowserMozilla	-0.983**	-0.576*	-0.370	-0.477*	-0.803*	-0.375
	(0.333)	(0.236)	(0.234)	(0.189)	(0.340)	(0.316)
Week14*ModeBrowserMozilla	-0.602	-0.329	-0.428	-0.114	-0.468	-0.420
	(0.316)	(0.224)	(0.222)	(0.180)	(0.322)	(0.300)
Week15*ModeBrowserMozilla	-0.458	-0.290	-0.057	-0.343	-0.406	-0.214
	(0.324)	(0.230)	(0.227)	(0.184)	(0.330)	(0.307)
Week16*ModeBrowserMozilla	-0.456	-0.067	-0.218	-0.203	-0.505	-0.153
	(0.324)	(0.230)	(0.227)	(0.184)	(0.330)	(0.307)
R ²	0.554	0.547	0.624	0.290	0.492	0.270
N	68,393	68,393	68,393	68,393	68,393	68,393

Notes: Each column refers to a separate regression of specification (5) on the unmatched sample. Each cell refers to the respective coefficient of the independent variables in the first column on the unmatched sample.

***p < 0.001, **p < 0.01, *p < 0.05.

Table S6. Robustness Check on Propensity Score Matching (PSM)

	Article Views	Breadth	Visits	Article Views per Visit	Hard News	Soft News
β_1	0.255*** (0.020)	0.166*** (0.013)	0.201*** (0.014)	0.049*** (0.009)	0.240*** (0.021)	0.145*** (0.018)
β_2	0.129*** (0.027)	0.082*** (0.017)	0.104*** (0.020)	0.027* (0.011)	0.162*** (0.028)	0.082*** (0.024)
N	30,766	30,766	30,766	30,766	30,766	30,766
R ²	0.623	0.590	0.698	0.556	0.636	0.621

Notes: β_1 represents the 1-week effect and β_2 represents the 5-week effect. Each column refers to a separate regression of the following model on a matched sample of ad blocker adopters and non-adopters using propensity score matching (psm):

$$\log(Y_{it} + 1) = \alpha_i + \delta_t + \beta_1 * I_{it1}(\text{within 1 week of Treatment}_{it}) + \beta_2 * I_{it2}(\text{remaining weeks since Treatment}_{it}) + \varepsilon_{it}.$$

R² computation includes the explanatory power of the fixed effects. Standard errors clustered at the user-level appear in parentheses.

*** p < 0.001, ** p < 0.01, * p < 0.05.

*Web Appendix D. Robustness Checks on Different Cutoff Periods
and Longer Pre-Treatment Periods*

Table S7. Robustness Check Using 1 Week as Cutoff Period

	Article Views	Breadth	Visits	Article Views per Visit	Hard News	Soft News
β_1	0.262*** (0.008)	0.157*** (0.005)	0.224*** (0.006)	0.035*** (0.004)	0.239*** (0.008)	0.178*** (0.007)
β_2	0.132*** (0.010)	0.070*** (0.007)	0.130*** (0.007)	0.010* (0.004)	0.140*** (0.010)	0.142*** (0.008)
N	203,852	203,852	203,852	203,852	203,852	203,852
R ²	0.689	0.677	0.747	0.602	0.686	0.656

Notes: β_1 represents the 1-week effect and β_2 represents the 5-week effect. Each column refers to a separate regression of the following model on the unmatched sample: $\log(Y_{it} + 1) = \alpha_i + \delta_t + \beta_1 * I_{it1}(\text{within 1 week of Treatment}_{it}) + \beta_2 * I_{it2}(\text{remaining weeks since Treatment}_{it}) + \varepsilon_{it}$. R² computation includes the explanatory power of the fixed effects. Standard errors clustered at the user-level appear in parentheses. ***p < 0.001, **p < 0.01, *p < 0.05.

Table S8. Robustness Check Using 3 Weeks as Cutoff Period

	Article Views	Breadth	Visits	Article Views per Visit	Hard News	Soft News
β_1	0.240*** (0.011)	0.136*** (0.007)	0.205*** (0.008)	0.031*** (0.005)	0.203*** (0.012)	0.191*** (0.010)
β_2	0.083*** (0.014)	0.040*** (0.009)	0.073*** (0.010)	0.011 (0.006)	0.089*** (0.014)	0.113*** (0.011)
N	167,668	167,668	167,668	167,668	167,668	167,668
R ²	0.678	0.672	0.734	0.604	0.677	0.641

Notes: β_1 represents the 1-week effect and β_2 represents the 5-week effect. Each column refers to a separate regression of the following model on the unmatched sample: $\log(Y_{it} + 1) = \alpha_i + \delta_t + \beta_1 * I_{it1}(\text{within 1 week of Treatment}_{it}) + \beta_2 * I_{it2}(\text{remaining weeks since Treatment}_{it}) + \varepsilon_{it}$. R² computation includes the explanatory power of the fixed effects. Standard errors clustered at the user-level appear in parentheses. ***p < 0.001, **p < 0.01, *p < 0.05.

Table S9. Robustness Check Using 4 Weeks as Cutoff Period

	Article Views	Breadth	Visits	Article Views per Visit	Hard News	Soft News
β_1	0.268*** (0.019)	0.152*** (0.013)	0.215*** (0.013)	0.040*** (0.009)	0.255*** (0.019)	0.190*** (0.017)
β_2	0.093** (0.029)	0.047* (0.020)	0.050* (0.020)	0.033* (0.014)	0.122*** (0.031)	0.097*** (0.027)
N	142,074	142,074	142,074	142,074	142,074	142,074
R ²	0.672	0.670	0.720	0.609	0.673	0.629

Notes: β_1 represents the 1-week effect and β_2 represents the 5-week effect. Each column refers to a separate regression of the following model on the unmatched sample: $\log(Y_{it} + 1) = \alpha_i + \delta_t + \beta_1 * I_{it1}(\text{within 1 week of Treatment}_{it}) + \beta_2 * I_{it2}(\text{remaining weeks since Treatment}_{it}) + \varepsilon_{it}$. R² computation includes the explanatory power of the fixed effects. Standard errors clustered at the user-level appear in parentheses. ***p < 0.001, **p < 0.01, *p < 0.05.

Table S10. Robustness Check Using Week 1 to Week 11 as Pre-Treatment Period

	Article Views	Breadth	Visits	Article Views per Visit	Hard News	Soft News
β_1	0.301*** (0.040)	0.234*** (0.029)	0.268*** (0.031)	0.149*** (0.019)	0.232*** (0.039)	0.167*** (0.033)
β_2	0.146** (0.047)	0.087* (0.035)	0.130*** (0.039)	-0.013 (0.020)	0.139** (0.044)	0.056 (0.031)
N	14,273	14,273	14,273	14,273	14,273	14,273
R ²	0.472	0.469	0.537	0.330	0.471	0.461

Notes: β_1 represents the 1-week effect and β_2 represents the 5-week effect. Each column refers to a separate regression of the following model on a matched sample from week 1 to week 16 (full observation period): $\log(Y_{it} + 1) = \alpha_i + \delta_t + \beta_1 * I_{it1}(\text{within 1 week of Treatment}_{it}) + \beta_2 * I_{it2}(\text{remaining weeks since Treatment}_{it}) + \varepsilon_{it}$
R² computation includes the explanatory power of the fixed effects. Standard errors clustered at the user-level appear in parentheses. *** p < 0.001, ** p < 0.01, * p < 0.05.

*Web Appendix E. Robustness Checks on Effect Decomposition
Using Other Quasi-Experimental Designs*

Table S11. Robustness Check on Effect Decomposition Using Ad Blocker Early Adopters as Treatment Group and Ad Blocker Late Adopters as Control Group

	Article Views	Breadth	Visits	Article Views per Visit	Hard News	Soft News
β_1	0.322* (0.127)	0.207* (0.082)	0.072 (0.059)	0.211** (0.079)	0.272* (0.126)	0.092 (0.098)
β_2	-0.010 (0.133)	0.019 (0.086)	0.093 (0.092)	-0.037 (0.058)	0.060 (0.130)	-0.037 (0.110)
N	1,423	1,423	1,423	1,423	1,423	1,423
R ²	0.462	0.423	0.588	0.478	0.550	0.557

Notes: β_1 represents the 1-week effect and β_2 represents the 5-week effect. Each column refers to a separate regression of the following model on the matched sample of early and late adopters. R² computation includes the explanatory power of the fixed effects: $\log(Y_{it} + 1) = \alpha_i + \delta_t + \beta_1 * I_{it1}(\text{within 1 week of Treatment}_{it}) + \beta_2 * I_{it2}(\text{remaining weeks since Treatment}_{it}) + \varepsilon_{it}$. Standard errors clustered at the user-level appear in parentheses. ***p < 0.001, **p < 0.01, *p < 0.05.

Table S12. Robustness Check on Effect Decomposition Using Ad Blocker Abandoners as Treatment Group and Continuous Ad Blocker Users as Control Group

	Article Views	Breadth	Visits	Article Views per Visit	Hard News	Soft News
β_1	-0.204*** (0.016)	-0.127*** (0.010)	-0.161*** (0.011)	-0.038*** (0.007)	-0.195*** (0.016)	-0.063*** (0.013)
β_2	-0.115*** (0.023)	-0.076*** (0.014)	-0.109*** (0.016)	-0.017 (0.009)	-0.107*** (0.023)	0.019 (0.020)
N	48,833	48,833	48,833	48,833	48,833	48,833
R ²	0.748	0.702	0.790	0.654	0.743	0.725

Notes: β_1 represents the 1-week effect and β_2 represents the 5-week effect. Each column refers to a separate regression of the following model on the unmatched sample of abandoners and continuous ad blocker users.: $\log(Y_{it} + 1) = \alpha_i + \delta_t + \beta_1 * I_{it1}(\text{within 1 week of Treatment}_{it}) + \beta_2 * I_{it2}(\text{remaining weeks since Treatment}_{it}) + \varepsilon_{it}$. R² computation includes the explanatory power of the fixed effects. Standard errors clustered at the user-level appear in parentheses. ***p < 0.001, **p < 0.01, *p < 0.05.

Web Appendix F. Causal Assumptions, Challenges, and Solutions

To identify the causal effect of ad blocker adoption on news consumption, we follow the Rubin Causal Model, the workhorse model in causal inference in the economics and marketing literature (Imbens and Wooldridge 2009; Rosenbaum and Rubin 1983). Imbens and Wooldridge (2009) summarize the causal assumptions under the Rubin Causal Model as follows:

Assumption 1. Unconfoundedness

$$w_i \perp (Y_i(0), Y_i(1)) | X_i.$$

The unconfoundedness assumption assumes that no observed or unobserved variables (X_i) correlate with the potential outcome ($Y_i(0)$ or $Y_i(1)$) and the treatment (w_i).

Assumption 2. Overlap

$$0 < pr(w_i = 1 | X_i = x) < 1, \text{ for all } x.$$

The overlap assumption assumes that the support of the conditional distribution of X_i given $w_i = 0$ overlaps completely with that of the conditional distribution of X_i given $w_i = 1$.

We summarize these causal assumptions as well as the resulting identification challenges and our solutions in Table S13.

Table S13. Causal Assumptions, Challenges, and Solutions

Causal Assumption	Challenge	Solution	Specification
Unconfoundedness	Users differ in observed and time-invariant ways	Coarsened exact matching	Main Specification (Table 4)
	Users differ in unobserved and time-invariant ways	Individual-fixed effect	
	Seasonality	Week-fixed effect	
	Users differ in unobserved reasons related to ad blocker adoption	Compare results for subsamples of ad blocker users (i.e., early vs. late adopters and abandoners vs. always adopters)	Robustness Check (Table 4)
	Unexplained part of adoption decision (error term) related to news consumption	Heckman selection model	Robustness Check (Table S14 & S15)
	Users differ in time-varying ways	Time-varying controls	Robustness Check (Table S2 & S5)
Overlap	Unbalanced empirical distribution of covariates between treatment and control group	Coarsened exact matching	Table 3

Web Appendix G. Heckman Selection Model

To formally test whether a user's ad blocker adoption poses a selection bias (e.g., a user anticipates to read more news and thus adopts an ad blocker), we use the Heckman selection model (Heckman 1979). In the marketing literature, the Heckman selection model has been used in the past to test and correct for the selection bias of an individual's (a household's) technology adoption decision (Bronnenberg et al. 2010; Narang and Shankar 2019).

In the first stage, we model a user's ad blocker adoption decision. Survey studies (Mathur et al. 2018; Newman et al. 2016; Pritchard 2021; Redondo and Aznar 2018; Singh and Potdar 2009; Sołtysik-Piorunkiewicz et al. 2019; Vratonjic et al. 2013) outline that users adopt an ad blocker mainly for three reasons: the annoyance of ads, page loading speed, and privacy concerns. Therefore, we look for user characteristics that can serve as proxies for these three reasons to adopt an ad blocker.

First, to proxy for ad annoyance, we use the user's number of page views from mobile (rather than desktop) devices. We assume that ads are likely to be more annoying on mobile devices because mobile devices tend to have smaller screen sizes than desktops. Second, we capture page loading speed by a user's JavaScript version and assume that users with older JavaScript versions load pages slower than users with newer JavaScript versions. Third, for the role of privacy concerns, we use a binary indicator that is one if a user has ever rejected a cookie (and zero otherwise). The underlying assumption is that users who have ever rejected a cookie are more privacy-concerned than users who never rejected a cookie.

In addition, we add a user's most frequently-used browser in the pre-treatment period as an explanatory variable into the model for the ad blocker adoption decision. The reason is that an external event happened during our observation period that triggered a large amount of consumer awareness and a significant increase in the adoption of ad blockers. That event is the release of iOS9 on the Apple iPhone on September 16, 2015, which is in week 15 of our observation period. With iOS9, Apple offered, for the first time, a mobile operating system that allowed for a content blocking feature. That feature made mobile ad blocker software for iPhone possible and also created massive consumer awareness for ad blockers. Google

Search Trends support this massive increase in consumer behavior because the search volume for the term “ad blocker” peaks to its largest volume ever (i.e., 100) during September 2015, as shown in Figure S1 and Figure S2.

When we check the related queries for the keyword “ad blocker” during September 2015, we find that the search query with the largest increase is “best iOS 9 ad blocker” and the most popular search query is “chrome ad blocker”, as shown in Figure S3 and Figure S4. The most popular search query reflects that users also learn about ad blockers for other browsers (here: Chrome) during the iOS 9 event. All those observations are in line with our expectation that the release of iOS9 yields a high ad blocker adoption rate during our observation period. Thus, we include a variable that captures a user’s most frequently used browser in the pre-treatment period (for short: mode browser) as the exclusive variables for the ad blocker adoption decision. Our idea is that a user who most frequently used an Apple browser in the pre-treatment period is more likely to adopt an ad blocker because of the external event in which Apple made an ad blocking feature available.

**Figure S1. Google Search for the Term “Ad Blocker”
(Worldwide) from 2004 to 2020**




Figure S2. Google Search for the Term “Ad Blocker” (Worldwide) in September, 2015



Figure S3. Related Topics and Related Queries with the Biggest Increase for “Ad Blocker” on Google Search Trends (Worldwide) in September, 2015





Figure S4. Most Popular Related Topics and Related Queries for “Ad Blocker” on Google Search Trends (Worldwide) in September, 2015



Thus, in the first stage, we estimate the following probit model:

$$(6) \quad \text{Adoption}_i = \alpha + \beta_1 * \text{CookieDeleted}_i + \beta_2 * \text{MobileViews}_i + \beta_3 * \text{JavaScript}_i + \beta_4 * \text{ModeBrowser}_i + \varepsilon_i,$$

where Adoption_i is the ad blocker adoption decision of a user i ; α is the intercept; CookieDeleted_i is coded as 1 if user i has not always accepted a cookie in the pre-treatment period; MobileViews_i is a user's average weekly number of page impressions generated on a mobile device in the pre-treatment period; JavaScript_i is the most frequently used JavaScript version of a user i in the pre-treatment period, with a version below 1.5 as baseline; ModeBrowser_i is a dummy-coded categorical variable that describes whether a particular browser (which could be either Apple Safari, Google Chrome, Microsoft Internet Explorer, Mozilla Firefox, or a group of all the other browsers) is the most frequently used browser by user i in the pre-treatment period, with Microsoft Internet Explorer as a baseline because it is the default browser for Windows and most likely used by the least tech-savvy users; ε_i is the error term.

Table S14. First Stage of Heckman Selection Model

	Adoption
(Intercept)	3.800 (48.178)
CookieDeleted	0.379 (0.403)
MobileVisits	0.012*** (0.001)
JavaScript1.5	-7.857 (68.134)
JavaScript1.6	-4.543 (48.178)
JavaScript1.8	-4.055 (48.178)
ModeBrowserApple (Baseline: Microsoft)	0.831*** (0.022)
ModeBrowserGoogle	0.257*** (0.028)
ModeBrowserMozilla	0.498*** (0.043)
ModeBrowserOthers	2.035*** (0.480)
N	21,068

Notes: The model is estimated on a sample not matched with the first stage variables but matched with all other variables in Table 3.

*** p < 0.001, ** p < 0.01, * p < 0.05. Standard errors appear in parentheses.

Table S14 reports the result of the first stage of the Heckman selection model. According to our expectation, users who are more likely to browse on a mobile device and use non-Microsoft browsers most frequently (i.e., either Apple Safari, Google Chrome, Mozilla Firefox or any other browsers) are more likely to adopt an ad blocker.

In the second stage, we estimate the same model (1) as in the main paper. Additionally, we include the inverse mills ratio (from the first stage of the Heckman selection model, see Table S14), capturing that the first-stage error could affect the second-stage model. Notably, any variables omitted by the first stage would be captured in the error term, including whether a user anticipates reading more news or spending more time online. A t-test on the

inverse mills ratio is thus a direct test on the selection bias of ad blocker adoption on news consumption while making only one joint normality assumption of the first and second stage error terms.

Table S15 reports the second-stage results of Heckman selection model.

Table S15. Second-Stage Results of Heckman Selection Model

	Article Views	Breadth
(Intercept)	1.655*** (0.036)	1.303*** (0.025)
β_1	0.259** (0.032)	0.147 (0.023)
β_2	0.171*** (0.027)	0.126*** (0.019)
invMillsRatio	-0.073 (0.039)	-0.019 (0.028)
Sigma	0.978	0.684
Rho	-0.075	-0.027
N	21,068	21,068

Note: The model is estimated on a sample not matched with the first stage variables but matched with all other variables in Table 3.

***p < 0.001, **p < 0.01, *p < 0.05. Standard errors appear in parentheses.

As shown in Table S15, the 1-week and 5-week effects (β_1 and β_2) are still significant and qualitatively similar to our estimates from the main specification (shown in Table 4). More importantly, the parameter of the inverse Mills Ratio is -0.073 with a t-value of 0.039 for article views and -0.019 with a t-value of 0.028, suggesting that we cannot reject the null hypothesis (i.e., the absence of a sample selection bias) at our conventional significance level ($p < 0.05$). In other words, we do not find evidence for selection bias in our case (e.g., it is not a user's anticipated news consumption influences his/her decision to adopt an ad blocker, especially considering that ad blockers perform the same function on all websites, whether or not it's a news website or not).

Web Appendix H. Robustness Checks on Logarithm Transformed Dependent Variable

**Table S16. Robustness Check on Using Original Value
(Instead of Log) as Dependent Variable**

	Ad Blocker Adoption		Ad Blocker Early Adoption		Ad Blocker Abandonment	
	Article Views	Breadth	Article Views	Breadth	Article Views	Breadth
β_1	2.309*** (0.356)	0.873*** (0.111)	3.126** (1.192)	1.039** (0.340)	-1.350 (1.215)	-0.530 (0.377)
β_2	1.419*** (0.412)	0.425** (0.143)	0.441 (1.473)	0.214 (0.383)	0.281 (1.998)	0.168 (0.490)
N	9,370	9,370	1,423	1,423	1,009	1,009
R ²	0.503	0.497	0.477	0.442	0.554	0.570

Notes: β_1 represents the 1-week effect and β_2 represents the 5-week effect. Each column refers to a separate regression of the following model on the matched sample: $Y_{it} = \alpha_i + \delta_t + \beta_1 * I_{it1}(\text{within 1 week of Treatment}_{it}) + \beta_2 * I_{it2}(\text{remaining weeks since Treatment}_{it}) + \varepsilon_{it}$. R² computation includes the explanatory power of the fixed effects. Standard errors clustered at the user-level appear in parentheses. ***p < 0.001, **p < 0.01, *p < 0.05.

Table S17. Robustness Check on Using Log (Y + 0.1) as Dependent Variable

	Ad Blocker Adoption		Ad Blocker Early Adoption		Ad Blocker Abandonment	
	Article Views	Breadth	Article Views	Breadth	Article Views	Breadth
β_1	0.434*** (0.063)	0.315*** (0.051)	0.450* (0.197)	0.312* (0.149)	-0.420* (0.187)	-0.250 (0.151)
β_2	0.232** (0.083)	0.161* (0.069)	-0.041 (0.198)	-0.002 (0.152)	0.134 (0.218)	0.127 (0.172)
N	9,370	9,370	1,423	1,423	1,009	1,009
R ²	0.465	0.455	0.425	0.384	0.524	0.507

Notes: β_1 represents the 1-week effect and β_2 represents the 5-week effect. Each column refers to a separate regression of the following model on the matched sample: $\log(Y_{it} + 0.1) = \alpha_i + \delta_t + \beta_1 * I_{it1}(\text{within 1 week of Treatment}_{it}) + \beta_2 * I_{it2}(\text{remaining weeks since Treatment}_{it}) + \varepsilon_{it}$. R² computation includes the explanatory power of the fixed effects. Standard errors clustered at the user-level appear in parentheses. ***p < 0.001, **p < 0.01, *p < 0.05.

*Web Appendix I. Treatment Effect on Article Views in Each News Category
and on Page Views in Each Non-News Category*

Table S18. Treatment Effect on Article Views in Each News Category

	International Political	Regional Political	Local Political	Economy	Finance	Opinion	Sport	Art & Culture
β_1	0.184*** (0.032)	0.108*** (0.028)	0.068** (0.021)	0.145*** (0.027)	0.086*** (0.024)	0.085*** (0.022)	0.120*** (0.028)	0.061*** (0.018)
β_2	0.092* (0.040)	0.055 (0.034)	0.046 (0.027)	0.088** (0.031)	0.065* (0.028)	0.056* (0.027)	0.034 (0.030)	0.030 (0.022)
N	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370
R ²	0.485	0.454	0.425	0.437	0.575	0.346	0.594	0.348
	Lifestyle	Brief	News Ticker	Outlook	Transportation	Science	Sunday News	Photo stream
β_1	0.015 (0.011)	0.009 (0.006)	0.016 (0.016)	0.078*** (0.021)	0.010 (0.007)	0.025 (0.013)	0.030* (0.015)	0.021 (0.012)
β_2	0.013 (0.014)	0.013 (0.009)	-0.007 (0.016)	0.035 (0.026)	0.019 (0.014)	-0.004 (0.013)	0.014 (0.021)	0.005 (0.014)
N	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370
R ²	0.314	0.265	0.471	0.368	0.348	0.367	0.266	0.304
	Video	Digital	Special	Data				
β_1	0.013* (0.006)	0.041** (0.015)	0.004 (0.004)	0.000 (0.002)				
β_2	0.006 (0.008)	0.015 (0.018)	0.003 (0.003)	0.001 (0.003)				
N	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370				
R ²	0.136	0.455	0.160	0.193				

Notes: β_1 represents the 1-week effect and β_2 represents the 5-week effect. Each column refers to a separate regression of the following model on the matched sample of ad blocker adopters and non-adopters: $Y_{it} = \alpha_i + \delta_t + \beta_1 * I_{it1}(\text{within 1 week of Treatment}_{it}) + \beta_2 * I_{it2}(\text{remaining weeks since Treatment}_{it}) + \varepsilon_{it}$. R² computation includes the explanatory power of the fixed effects. Standard errors clustered at the user-level appear in parentheses. ***p < 0.001, **p < 0.01, *p < 0.05.

Table S19. Treatment Effect on Page Views in Each Non-News Category

	Homepage	Weather	Play Page	Account	Others	Search	Archive
β_1	0.258*** (0.035)	0.016 (0.015)	0.002 (0.005)	0.006 (0.022)	0.015 (0.011)	0.003 (0.014)	0.008* (0.004)
β_2	0.137** (0.044)	0.012 (0.018)	0.001 (0.008)	0.000 (0.030)	0.012 (0.013)	-0.015 (0.018)	0.006 (0.003)
N	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370	9,370
R ²	0.665	0.709	0.759	0.332	0.207	0.283	0.191

Notes: β_1 represents the 1-week effect and β_2 represents the 5-week effect. Each column refers to a separate regression of the following model on the matched sample of ad blocker adopters and non-adopters: $Y_{it} = \alpha_i + \delta_t + \beta_1 * I_{it1}(\text{within 1 week of Treatment}_{it}) + \beta_2 * I_{it2}(\text{remaining weeks since Treatment}_{it}) + \varepsilon_{it}$. R² computation includes the explanatory power of the fixed effects. Standard errors clustered at the user-level appear in parentheses. ***p < 0.001, **p < 0.01, *p < 0.05.

Web Appendix J. Robustness Check on Zero Visit Weeks

Table S20. Robustness on Article Views and Breadth with Zero Visit Weeks

	Article Views	Breadth
β_1	0.510*** (0.037)	0.461*** (0.029)
β_2	0.254*** (0.048)	0.248*** (0.038)
N	13,220	13,220
R ²	0.531	0.615

Notes: β_1 represents the 1-week effect and β_2 represents the 5-week effect. Each column refers to a separate regression of the following model on the matched sample of ad blocker adopters and non-adopters with user zero visit weeks included: $\log(Y_{it} + 1) = \alpha_i + \delta_t + \beta_1 * I_{it1}(\text{within 1 week of Treatment}_{it}) + \beta_2 * I_{it2}(\text{remaining weeks since Treatment}_{it}) + \varepsilon_{it}$. ***p < 0.001, **p < 0.01, *p < 0.05

Table S21. Robustness on Article Views and Breadth with Tobit Model

	Article Views	Breadth
β_1	0.362*** (0.037)	0.221*** (0.024)
β_2	0.205*** (0.044)	0.118*** (0.029)
Log Likelihood	-7689.2	-5240.8
N	9,370	9,370

Notes: β_1 represents the 1-week effect and β_2 represents the 5-week effect. Each column refers to a separate regression of the following model on the matched sample without user zero visit week using a truncated regression model: $\log(Y_{it} + 1) = \alpha_i + \delta_t + \beta_1 * I_{it1}(\text{within 1 week of Treatment}_{it}) + \beta_2 * I_{it2}(\text{remaining weeks since Treatment}_{it}) + \varepsilon_{it}$. ***p < 0.001, **p < 0.01, *p < 0.05

Web Appendix K. Examination of User Demographics on Ad Blocker Adoption

Table S22. Logistic Regression of Ad Blocker Adoption on User Demographics

	Ad Blocker Adoption
(Intercept)	-1.669*** (0.281)
Gender (Male)	0.282*** (0.058)
Income Index 2	-0.456*** (0.127)
Income Index 3	-0.236* (0.115)
Income Index 4	-0.347** (0.130)
Income Index 5	-0.352** (0.116)
Income Index 6	-0.259* (0.114)
Age 25 – 19	0.251 (0.324)
Age 30 – 34	0.240 (0.303)
Age 35 – 39	0.405 (0.281)
Age 40 – 44	0.316 (0.273)
Age 45 – 49	0.354 (0.270)
Age 50 – 54	0.239 (0.270)
Age 55 – 59	0.107 (0.271)
Age 60 – 64	0.316 (0.270)
Age 65 – 69	-0.004 (0.273)
Age 70 – 74	-0.016 (0.273)
Age 75 – 79	-0.014 (0.279)
Age 80 – 85	0.228 (0.282)
AIC	13161.475
BIC	13305.086
Log Likelihood	-6561.738
Deviance	13123.475
N	14,164

Notes: This table reports the coefficient of the following logit model on the unmatched sample: $Adoption_i = \alpha + \beta_1 * Gender_i + \beta_2 * Income_i + \beta_3 * Age_i + \varepsilon_i$; $\exp(\beta)$ is the odds ratio between ad blocker adopters and non-adopters. The reference group for gender is female, for income is income index 1 (the lowest income category), for age is 20-24. The coefficient of Gender (male) indicates that the odds of being an ad blocker adopter in the male group is $\exp(0.282) = 1.33$ times that of being an ad blocker in the female group. The coefficient of Income Index 2 indicates that the odds of being an ad blocker adopter in the Income Index 2 group is $\exp(0.282) = 0.63$ times that of being an ad blocker in the Income Index 1 group. ***p < 0.001, **p < 0.01, *p < 0.05

References

Bronnenberg, Bart J, Jean-Pierre Dubé, and Carl F Mela (2010), "Do Digital Video Recorders Influence Sales?," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 47 (6), 998-1010.

Heckman, James J (1979), "Sample Selection Bias as a Specification Error," *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, 47 (1), 153-61.

Imbens, Guido W and Jeffrey M Wooldridge (2009), "Recent Developments in the Econometrics of Program Evaluation," *Journal of Economic Literature*, 47 (1), 5-86.

Mathur, Arunesh, Jessica Vitak, Arvind Narayanan, and Marshini Chetty (2018), "Characterizing the Use of Browser-Based Blocking Extensions to Prevent Online Tracking," in Fourteenth Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security ((Mathur et al.) 2018).

Narang, Unnati and Venkatesh Shankar (2019), "Mobile App Introduction and Online and Offline Purchases and Product Returns," *Marketing Science*, 38 (5), 756-72.

Newman, Nic, Richard Fletcher, Antonis Kalogeropoulos, David AL Levy, and Rasmus-Kleis Nielsen (2016), "Digital News Report 2016," in Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism.

Pritchard, Marc (2021), "Commentary: "Half My Digital Advertising Is Wasted..."", *Journal of Marketing*, 85 (1), 26-29.

Redondo, Ignacio and Gloria Aznar (2018), "To Use or Not to Use Ad Blockers? The Roles of Knowledge of Ad Blockers and Attitude toward Online Advertising," *Telematics and Informatics*, 35 (6), 1607-16.

Rosenbaum, Paul R and Donald B Rubin (1983), "The Central Role of the Propensity Score in Observational Studies for Causal Effects," *Biometrika*, 70 (1), 41-55.

Singh, Ashish Kumar and Vidyasagar Potdar (2009), "Blocking Online Advertising-a State of the Art," in Proceedings of 2009 IEEE International Conference on Industrial Technology: IEEE.

Sołtysik-Piorunkiewicz, Anna, Artur Strzelecki, and Edyta Abramek (2019), "Evaluation of Adblock Software Usage," *Complex Systems Informatics and Modeling Quarterly* (21), 51-63.

Vratonjic, Nevena, Mohammad Hossein Manshaei, Jens Grossklags, and Jean-Pierre Hubaux (2013), "Ad-Blocking Games: Monetizing Online Content under the Threat of Ad Avoidance," in *The Economics of Information Security and Privacy*, Rainer Böhme, ed. Berlin,

Heidelberg: Springer, 49-73.