

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).

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).

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).

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.

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

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.

Technical edits

Line 40: typo in: “op dialogue”.

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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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.