

## Editor comments following peer-review

### 1. Authors response to Reviewer #1.

I thank the authors for their clear response to the comments by Reviewer 1 and for thoughtfully incorporating their recommendations to improve the manuscript.

### 2. Authors response to Reviewer #2.

I thank the authors for their clear response to the comments by Reviewer 1 and for accepting to incorporate the structural changes to the Methods (3.5) and Results sections to improve the readability of the manuscript.

### 3. Editor's comments

The topic of the manuscript is timely and highly relevant not only to the climate science community, but to the broader discussion on public perception of (advocating) scientists.

The manuscript is very well-written and easy to follow. The research questions and hypothesis are clearly stated from the beginning and addressed in the discussion. The structure is well-developed with sections for introduction, methods, results, limitations and future work. The figures are clear and include the relevant statistical data.

In addition to the comments by Reviewers 1 and 2, I would like to contribute with minor suggestions for your consideration, as well as technical edits (mostly typos), to further strengthen the paper (see below).

We thank the editor for these very encouraging and warm comments; we appreciate their support for our study.

### Discussion suggestions

To continue the discussion on Perceived Credibility and Climate Change Concern from Reviewer 1 on (lines 345-348), if I may add another point to this line, line 387-388, and Figure 7: Could it also be a case of confirmation bias? (ie. Those with high Climate change concern would rate the advocating scientist as more credible, and vice versa).

This is a very good point. We have now added another sentence to the revision (lines 383-384 of the track-changed pdf): *“Furthermore, there could also be some confirmation bias where respondents with high Climate Change Concern would rate the advocating author as more credible, and vice versa.”*

Section 3.4 on Respondents and survey design. Related to Reviewer 2 comment on the “composition of participants”, I would kindly ask the authors to include a description of the demographic information asked in the survey (perhaps between lines 180-184), as this is not

explicitly mentioned until the analysis of Figure 1 (currently line 210, but I assume will be moved to Results in the final edited version).

We have now added a sentence at the beginning of section 3.5 (lines 205-206 of the track-changed manuscript: “*As demographic information was readily available as respondents were part of an existing Ipsos I&O panel, these were not measured (see Appendix C for an overview).*”

Line 75: “do not engage in advocacy, despite their willingness”. If there are reasons/hurdles as to why they don’t engage, please include some examples.

This sentence appeared in the initial version of the manuscript, and has been removed in the revised version (as asked by the reviewers). We now added “*because of intellectual (e.g., not the role of researcher or lack of knowledge) or practical (e.g., lack of time or skills) barriers*” (lines 77-78 of the track-changed pdf), but do not want to go much deeper as that would take a lot of space and readers could better read the Dablander et al article itself (Figure 3 in that paper is specifically about the barriers).

Line 136-137: It would be interesting to add a line of how the platform vets experts (eg. university affiliation? Academic title?).

We have now added that the expertise is “*as identified by the topic of their PhD*” (line 141 of the track-changed pdf).

Line 224: It would be interesting to assess the impact of a Issue Advocate with a female name. There are studies showing how the general public associate “scientist” to male. Hence, I would recommend a future study that investigates perception and credibility by gender.

This is a very good suggestion. We have now added the following sentence to the Implications & future research section (lines 455-457 of the track-changed pdf): “*Furthermore, one could investigate whether an Issue Advocate text by a scientist with a feminine name would have the same response, as there are studies that show how the general public associate scientists with men (e.g., Suldo et al., 2019).*”

## Technical edits

Line 40: typo in: “op dialogue”.

We have changed to “*a dialogue*” in the revised manuscript (line 41 of the track-changed pdf).

Line 110: “visuals in a multimodal setting with texts”, it may be more straightforward to remove the word “multimodal”, as you are referring only to the two: text + visuals.

We have removed “*multimodal*” in the revised manuscript (line 116 of the track-changed pdf).

Line 119: typo, verb in singular: “these mostly focuses”.

We have changed to “*these mostly focus*” in the revised manuscript (line 125 of the track-changed pdf).

Line 122: comma might be better than n-dash.

We have changed this in the revised manuscript (line 128 of the track-changed pdf).

Line 158-159: consider adding () to you’re a, b, c list.

We have changed to a), b) and c) in the revised manuscript (lines 165-166 of the track-changed pdf).

Line 174: typo, word from singular to plural “types of visual elements”.

We have changed this in the revised manuscript (line 180 of the track-changed pdf).

Line 184: typo, exchange ‘for’ for ‘of’ in “representative for the wider”.

We have changed this in the revised manuscript (line 190 of the track-changed pdf).

Line 290: word missing, “fosters understanding of the text”.

We have changed this in the revised manuscript (line 323 of the track-changed pdf).

Line 369: typo, change to “nor difference”.

We have changed this in the revised manuscript (line 405 of the track-changed pdf).

## Appendix B

Line 600: To remain consistent with in-text reference to Bar and Photo conditions, please consider modifying title to, eg.: (B1) Bar chart and (B2) Photo conditions.

This is a good suggestion. We have now changed this to “*Figure B*” (line 639 in the track-changed pdf). Because half the respondents saw Figure B1 and half saw Figure B2, we don’t want to also put the number here.