

My notes and comments below are suggestions only.

- For notes related to mechanics, such as commas (eg, before 'but') or basic vocabulary (eg, 'of' rather than 'in'), I strongly suggest that you make the changes.
- For suggestions concerning phrasing, you should decide whether you not you think that my suggestion improves clarity and/or readability.
- For my comments on stats, please check these carefully; I have seen an otherwise sound article attacked on this, despite the fact that the findings did not change with the use of appropriate stats. Remember that you may get deniers reading your article, and who will do anything to discredit you.
- On that note, may I suggest that you refer, somewhere in your early paras, to Kutney's excellent and related article on climate denial in this special issue.
- The occasional thought is just that.

Happy tweaking, DC

1 **Quantifying the Impact of Skeptical Science Rebuttals in Reducing** 2 **Climate Misperceptions**

3 John Cook^{1,2}, Bärbel Winkler², Collin J.H.M. Maessen², Timo Lubitz^{2,3}, Doug Bostrom², Dana Nuccitelli^{2,4}

4 ¹ Melbourne Centre for Climate Change, University of Melbourne, 800 Swanston St, Parkville VIC 3053, Australia

5 ² Skeptical Science Inc., 12345 Lake City Way NE #2026/ Seattle, WA 98125

6 ³ German Citizens' Climate Lobby, Germany - Citizens' Climate Lobby Germany e.V. (CCL-D), Urbanstraße 20, D-81371

7 München

8 ⁴ Citizens' Climate Lobby, PO Box 181020 Coronado, CA 92178, USA

9 *Correspondence to:* Bärbel Winkler (baerbelw@skepticalscience.com)

Thank you for revising your ms. It will make a substantial contribution to our understanding both of how people navigate cognitively with Sceptical Science and of our broader understanding of denial and of how to counteract deniers. It will thus, I strongly hope, have a positive impact on climate education and literacy, and it may even indirectly and positively influence people's thinking about climate change. I congratulate the authors for being honestly self-critical, something that geosci comm needs to embrace more.

10 Quantifying the Impact of Skeptical Science Rebuttals in Reducing 11 Climate Misperceptions

12 John Cook^{1,2}, Bärbel Winkler², Collin J.H.M. Maessen², Timo Lubitz^{2,3}, Doug Bostrom², Dana Nuccitelli^{2,4}

13 ¹ Melbourne Centre for Climate Change, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

14 ² Skeptical Science, USA

15 ³ German Citizens' Climate Lobby, Germany

16 ⁴ Citizens' Climate Lobby, USA

17 Correspondence to: Bärbel Winkler (baerbelw@skepticalscience.com)

18 **Abstract.** Misinformation about climate change causes societal damage in a number of ways and consequently, resources are
19 required to support interventions that counter their influence. Aiming to meet this need, Skeptical Science is a highly-visited
20 website featuring 250 rebuttals of misinformation about climate change. The rebuttals are written at multiple levels—basic,
21 intermediate, and advanced—in order to reach as wide an audience as possible. This study collects survey data from visitors to the
22 website, assessing the effectiveness of rebuttals in reducing acceptance in climate myths and increasing acceptance of climate
23 facts. Our data found that nearly half of visitors were already highly convinced regarding climate facts. We found that the rebuttals
24 were effective in reducing belief in climate myths, but that some rebuttals show a concerning reduction in belief in climate facts.
25 The greatest improvement occurred with visitors who began with the most inaccurate climate perceptions. This indicates that the
26 website is useful for two main audiences - those who are convinced about climate change but looking for material to support their
27 own climate communication efforts, and those who disagree with climate facts but are open to new information. We examine
28 potential ways that Skeptical Science rebuttals could be updated to improve their performance in raising climate literacy and critical
29 thinking skills.

and assessed

the

, 'always a comma before but)

collected

30 1 Introduction

31 Despite the overwhelming scientific consensus on human-caused climate change (Cook et al., 2013; Cook et al., 2016), there is
32 still public confusion over the severity of climate change and therefore insufficient public demand for climate action. A significant
33 contributor to this lack of progress is climate misinformation, which damages society in a number of ways. The obvious impact of
34 climate misinformation is the instilling of false beliefs or lowering of accurate beliefs, with even just a few misleading statistics
35 reducing people's acceptance of the reality of climate change (Ranney & Clark, 2016). However, climate misinformation has more
36 subtle and subversive impacts beyond simply fostering misperceptions. One subversive effect in the cognitive domain is
37 misinformation's tendency to cancel out efforts to communicate facts. When people are confronted with conflicting pieces of
38 information (e.g., facts and misinformation) and have no way to resolve the conflict, they tend to disengage and believe neither
39 (McCright et al., 2016; van der Linden et al., 2017; Vraga et al., 2020). This impact is highly consequential for educators, scientists,
40 and communicators, as it means that ~~any~~ efforts to communicate facts can be cancelled out by misinformation.

the tendency for misinformation to

41 Other subversive effects are seen in the social domain, with climate misinformation polarizing the public, having a disproportionate
42 impact on political conservatives. This means that after being exposed to misinformation, people with different political
43 backgrounds end up further from each other in their climate perceptions (Cook et al., 2017). Another social effect is on scientists
44 who, when attacked, can be influenced to downplay how they report their scientific results, lest they appear to resemble the
45 stereotypes of biased scientists made in attacks made about them (Lewandowsky et al., 2015). This chilling effect extends beyond

expressed in

on

46 the scientific community, with the general public less likely to talk about climate change with friends and family, largely because
47 of fear of pushback (Geiger & Swim, 2016).

48 Climate misinformation in the form of conspiracy theories also causes damage spilling beyond the issue of climate change. One
49 study found that when people were exposed to a conspiracy theory about global warming, they were less likely to sign a petition
50 in support of measures to reduce global warming and less likely to donate to a charity (van der Linden, 2015). Conspiracy theories
51 also increase people’s feelings of powerlessness, uncertainty, and disillusionment, which reduces their intention to engage in
52 politics more broadly (Jolley & Douglas, 2014). This myriad of negative impacts necessitates the need to develop resources and
53 interventions to counter climate misinformation.

because,

54 Much psychological research has been conducted into effective ways to refute misinformation. One strategy is to dislodge myths
55 with a “replacement fact” that possesses at least the same explanatory relevance as the myth (Ecker et al., 2010; Seifert, 2002).
56 However, factual information alone may not be enough as when people are presented with both facts and myth countering the fact,
57 the two can cancel each other out (McCright et al., 2016; van der Linden et al., 2017; Vraga et al., 2020). This risk can be mitigated
58 by explaining the misleading rhetorical techniques or logical fallacies used by the misinformation to cast doubt on the facts (Cook
59 et al., 2017a). These disparate strategies have been synthesised in the Debunking Handbook 2020 which suggests that debunkings
60 should adopt a fact-myth-fallacy-fact structure (Lewandowsky et al., 2020). A complementary approach that often incorporates
61 these approaches is misconception-based learning (McCuin, Hayhoe, & Hayhoe, 2014) or agnotology-based learning (Bedford &
62 Cook, 2013), which involves teaching scientific facts through directly debunking science misconceptions.

63 An increasingly important concept in misinformation research is *discernment* – the ability to distinguish factual information from
64 misinformation. Discernment is commonly measured by taking the difference between agreement with facts and agreement with
65 misinformation (Pennycook & Rand, 2021). This is important because concerns have been raised that some anti-misinformation
66 interventions have resulted in reducing discernment, not only reducing agreement with misinformation but also reducing agreement
67 with facts (Modirrousta-Galian & Higham, 2023). Anti-misinformation interventions should seek to raise discernment by
68 increasing the gap between fact agreement and misinformation agreement.

69 1.1 Skeptical Science

i think that i read about a recent study that showed
consensus now to be at 99.9% or thereabouts -- or maybe
that was wishful thinking :-)

70 Skeptical Science is an international website and non-profit science education organization founded by John Cook in 2007. The
71 main purpose of the website is to debunk misconceptions and misinformation about human-caused climate change, featuring
72 more than 250 rebuttals of climate myths. The website is maintained by a team of academics and volunteers from around the
73 globe who actively contribute to published research. One highlight of Skeptical Science research output is an often-cited 97%
74 consensus paper (Cook et al., 2013), which was affirmed by a subsequent synthesis of consensus studies (Cook et al., 2016).

75 Other researchers have also drawn upon or analysed Skeptical Science’s content. For example, one study analysed user comments
76 on skepticscience.com, finding that one third of posts indicated a desire to communicate facts or educate (Metcalf, 2020). The
77 website’s encyclopedic list of climate myths has also been influential, with Elsasser & Dunlap (2013) drawing upon the 103 listed
78 rebuttals (at the time) in order to identify the prevalence of specific climate myths in newspaper op-eds. A later analysis of climate
79 denial referenced Skeptical Science’s 193 rebuttals (at the time), indicating the steady accumulation of debunkings (Hansson,
80 2017). The taxonomy of myths also served as the starting point in the inductive development of a comprehensive taxonomy of
81 contrarian claims about climate change (Coan et al., 2021). The website content is currently being used to train models that use
82 generative AI to automatically debunk climate misinformation (Zanartu et al., 2024).


83 The rebuttals are written at multiple levels, offering basic, intermediate, and advanced versions. They tackle common
84 misconceptions about climate change such as “global warming is not happening”, “It’s not caused by human activity”, “Climate

three

85 impacts are not bad”, and “Climate solutions are too hard”. The rebuttals receive most of the website’s traffic, with some individual
86 rebuttals viewed more than 20,000 times per month. They are listed by popularity, fixed numbers (for ease of reference), or
87 taxonomic categories for ease of access.

88 Over time, the design of the rebuttal content has evolved to be brought more in line with debunking best-practices recommended
89 from psychological research. The myth rebuttals initially led with and emphasized the myth that was being debunked (Fig. 1a).
90 Subsequently, the rebuttals were adapted using a format to de-emphasise the myth according to Schwarz et al. (2016)(Fig. 1b).

91 In late 2022, a thorough rebuttal revision project was initiated, motivated by the years that had passed since some rebuttals had
92 been written and the advances in climate science that had occurred during that time. Given the important role of readability on
93 reading comprehension (Zainurrahman et al., 2024), the rebuttals were made accessible to a wider range of readers with an 'at
94 a glance' primer section added to the start of the basic version of selected rebuttals (Fig. 1c).



95
96 **Figure 1: (a) First version of rebuttal, (b) Second version of rebuttal with initial fact and basic/intermediate/advanced levels, (c) Current**
97 **version with “At a glance” section.**

98 Despite much effort gone into rebuttal creation and revision over many years, no research had been conducted assessing the
99 effectiveness of the rebuttals in countering climate misinformation. Such an analysis could inform development of future rebuttals
100 and revision of existing rebuttals. Consequently, this study explores the research question: how effective are the Skeptical Science
101 rebuttals in reducing acceptance in climate myths and increasing acceptance of climate facts?


It might also help people formulate their own rebuttals in their work outside Skeptical Science.

102 2 Methods

103 This study collected survey data from a selection of visitors to skepticscience.com. Specifically, visitors who arrived directly at
104 a rebuttal having come from google.com, google.co.uk, or google.com.au were invited to participate in research. In other words,
105 users who conducted a search on Google then clicked on a link to a Skeptical Science rebuttal in the organic search results.¹ Users
106 who arrived at a non-English rebuttal were excluded from the final analysis as the research was conducted in English. Invited
107 visitors were shown a modal (an industry term for a pop-up box overlaying the webpage) asking if they wanted to participate (Fig.
108 2a). Visitors who indicated they wanted to participate were shown a consent form informing them about the experiment design
109 and how data would be handled (Fig. 2b).

¹ Analysing the search phrases used to find us are beyond the scope of this study. However, we do speculate on the purpose of most readers in coming to Skeptical Science in the Results and Discussion section.

110 If users consented, they were shown a single statement about climate change and asked to indicate their level of agreement on a 6-
 111 point Likert scale from "Strongly agree" to "Strongly disagree" (Fig. 2c). "Strongly agree" answers were assigned value 1 while
 112 "strongly disagree" answers were assigned value 6. Users were randomly shown either a factual or misinformation statement
 113 relevant to the rebuttal (all statements listed in Table A1). Answers to factual statements were reverse scored so that higher values
 114 equated to more accurate answers. Once they completed this single survey item, participants proceeded to read the rebuttal. If they
 115 scrolled to the end of the rebuttal, indicating that they had read the rebuttal, another modal screen was displayed, inviting them to
 116 again indicate their level of agreement with the same factual/misinformation statement. Users who failed to scroll to the end of the
 117 rebuttal were not shown the second survey question, and were excluded from the research data. After answering the final question,
 118 participants were thanked for their participation and could close the survey (Fig. 2d).



119 **Figure 2: Screenshot of modals used in experiment design. (a) Invitation to participate in research. (b) Informed consent form detailing**
 120 **research design. (c) Survey question. (d) Final thank you modal.**
 121

122 As well as the answer to the survey question, the user's IP address was recorded so that users whose IP address was already listed
 123 among existing research participants were not invited upon any subsequent visits (however, IP addresses were deleted in the
 124 anonymised version of the dataset). We also recorded Start Time (when the first survey question was loaded) and End Time (when
 125 the end survey was loaded). Time Spent was calculated as the difference between End Time and Start Time, noting that this also
 126 included the time spent filling out the pre-rebuttal survey. Data collection occurred from November 2021 to July 2025. Over this
 127 period, 858,016 visitors were shown the pop-up invitation to participate in research.

128 **3 Results**


129 Among the 13,432 people ~~that~~ consented to participate in the research and filled out the pre-rebuttal survey, 6,261 people (46%)
 130 went on to fill out the post-rebuttal survey. 3,146 participants were shown a factual statement in the survey quiz while 3,115 were
 131 shown a myth statement. The average time spent looking at the rebuttals was 4 minutes, with the median being 1 minute, indicating
 132 that readers scrolled through the rebuttal quickly (see Figure A7.1 in the Appendices for a distribution of reading times and speeds).

was this done randomly?
 alternately?

were not (no abbreviations - please check the rest of the ms and correct)

133 While some participants showed fast reading speeds, they weren't excluded from the analysis as they were representative of real-
134 world skimming behaviour and hence offered external validity.

135 The majority of participants came to the website already convinced about climate change. Figure 3 shows the distribution of pre-
136 rebuttal beliefs, revealing that nearly half of the participants (46.3%) showed full agreement with the climate fact or full
137 disagreement with the climate myth. In this figure and throughout our results, we refer to the single measure *accuracy* where strong
138 agreement with the factual statement and strong disagreement with the myth statement are designated the most accurate response.
139 Interestingly, the distribution of users was bi-modal with peaks at the extreme ends of the spectrum, indicating that most visitors
140 had a strong opinion about climate change one way or the other, with a minority of undecided visitors.




is this different from the survey in Fig 2? -- it might be good to make this explicit

who (pls use people who, not that; it is things that and humans who) pls correct throughout the ms

141 **Figure 3: Distribution of climate perceptions in pre-survey. 1 shows inaccurate answer, 6 shows accurate answer.**

143 Comparing the pre-rebuttal and post-rebuttal scores showed that overall (e.g., including participants that were shown fact
144 statements or myth statements), there was a small but non-significant improvement in accuracy. This was conducted through a
145 Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test, using the Common Language Effect Size (CLES) as a measure of effect size, finding a non-significant
146 difference between pre- and post-test scores with a small effect size ($p = 0.49$, $CLES = 0.05$). To examine the change in perceptions
147 in greater detail, we looked at the response to either factual statements or myth statements individually, shown in Fig. 4a and 4b.
148 Overall, there was a significant decrease in agreement with factual statements ($p = .006$, $CLES = .05$) and a significant decrease in
149 agreement with myth statements ($p = .001$, $CLES = .08$). While overall accuracy improved, the change was non-significant because
150 the decrease in accuracy in response to the factual statements partially canceled out the more accurate response to the myth
151 statements.

separately ??




152
153 **Figure 4: Change in accuracy among participants at varying pre-rebuttal values (positive value means increase in accuracy).** (a) Change
154 **in accuracy for participants shown factual statement (e.g., change in agreement with factual statement), (b) Change in accuracy for**
155 **participants shown myth statement (change in disagreement with misinformation statement), (c) Average change in accuracy for fact**
156 **and myth statements combined.**

157 The change in accuracy significantly depended on pre-existing accuracy. To explore this, a hierarchical regression analysis was
158 conducted to examine the moderating effect of pre-rebuttal accuracy on the change in accuracy, where B represents the slope of
159 the relationship between pre-rebuttal accuracy and change in accuracy and t is the t-test statistic. The results indicated a significant
160 interaction ($B = .14, t(6258) = 77.7, p < .001$). Figure 4c visualizes this dynamic, showing how the improvement in accuracy was
161 greatest for those with the lowest pre-rebuttal accuracy. Among the people who gave an inaccurate value in the pre-rebuttal survey
162 (1-3), 7.2% switched to an accurate value (4-6) in the post-rebuttal survey.

163 In order to better understand reader response to rebuttals, the change in perception was examined across different individual
164 rebuttals. Figure 5 shows the changes in myth and fact accuracy for 20 rebuttals that recorded at least 50 participants, with positive
165 values representing a shift towards greater accuracy. Consistent with Fig. 4, this shows that myth accuracy has on average a more
166 positive improvement compared to fact accuracy.

Pls make sure that this parametric test is the appropriate one. It may be that a non-parametric equivalent, eg, M-W U, may be more appropriate, and thus less open to questioning. Some/many analysts use the t-test for Likert scale data, when a non-parametric would be more appropriate. They generally give similar results.



167
168 **Figure 5: Change in accuracy with regard to (a) fact, (b) myth perceptions, and (c) myth and fact combined, for the 20 rebuttals with**
169 **most data (positive values mean increase in accuracy).**

170 Some rebuttals consistently perform well for both fact and myth (e.g. “climate impacts aren’t bad”, see Appendix A6 for links)
171 while other rebuttals perform badly for both fact and myth (e.g., basic and intermediate versions of “co2 was higher in past”). In
172 the case of the water vapor rebuttal, the change in myth accuracy is one of the better results while the change in fact perception is
173 the second worst result.

174 **that** To more closely explore potential explanations for the varied results, the content of the top three and bottom three rebuttals listed
175 in Fig. 5c were qualitatively examined. In particular, the rebuttals were inspected to see whether they possessed a factual
176 explanation that possessed at least the same explanatory relevance as the myth (Ecker et al., 2010) and an explanation of the fallacy
177 the myth used to distort the facts (Cook et al., 2017a). Overall, the top three rebuttals clearly explained replacement facts, while
178 the bottom three rebuttals failed to clearly explain replacement facts. All but one rebuttal included a fallacy explanation. The top
179 three rebuttals span three categories of climate misinformation casting doubt on the reality, cause, and impacts of global warming.
180 The most effective rebuttal debunked the myth “climate impacts are not bad”, with the next most effective rebuttals countering the
181 myths “climate change is caused by albedo changes” and “greenhouse effect is saturated.”

182 **to** In the rebuttal of “climate impacts are not bad”, the replacement fact was that the negative impacts of global warming far
183 outweighed the benefits. This fact is clearly and simply communicated, and reinforced repeatedly as the rebuttal compares negative
184 impacts to benefits across different aspects of the climate (e.g., agriculture, health, polar melting, etc). However, the rebuttal fails
185 to explicitly explain the myth’s fallacy, which is cherry picking benefits of climate change while ignoring negative impacts.

186 **to** The rebuttal of “climate change is caused by albedo changes” does explain the relevant fact **which is that** albedo is a feedback that
187 amplifies climate change rather than a forcing that drives climate change. However, this fact is not highlighted in the “what the
188 science says” box and could have been made more prominent, which may explain why belief in the fact did not increase from this
189 rebuttal. The fallacy in this myth involves cherry picking short periods in order to find spurious correlations between albedo and
190 temperature trends. While the rebuttal does show the long-term trend data which implicitly exposes this fallacy, it fails to explicitly
191 explain the misleading technique.

does it make sense to include a footnote or box insert that explains the term cherry picking, esp in climate terms ??

to

192 For the rebuttal of the myth “greenhouse effect is saturated,” the relevant fact is that more heat is being trapped high up in the
193 atmosphere where the air is thinner (Cook et al., 2015). The rebuttal implicitly alludes to this fact, mentioning the need to consider
194 the greenhouse effect at all levels of the atmosphere, but does not explicitly explain the fact. The rebuttal fails to explain the fallacy
195 of oversimplification, considering the atmosphere as a single layer when it consists of multiple layers (Cook et al., 2018; Flack et
196 al., 2024).

197 The worst and third-worst performing rebuttals were the basic and intermediate rebuttals of “CO2 was higher in the past.” This
198 myth argues that because CO2 has been much higher in the Earth’s deep past (e.g., over ten times current levels during the
199 Ordovician-Silurian period) without the world burning up, this casts doubt on the warming effect of CO2. The relevant fact is that
200 in the Earth’s deep past, the sun was cooler when CO2 was higher with the two forcings roughly balancing each other out (Cook
201 et al., 2015). The myth commits single cause fallacy, a form of oversimplification that fails to consider both factors. Both the basic
202 and intermediate debunkings fail to explain either the fact or the fallacy.

203 The second worst performing rebuttal addressed the myth “it’s cooling.” The replacement fact communicated in the “What the
204 Science Says” box simply says “it’s warming”, which is essentially just a negation of the myth without producing any substantive
205 details. The factual explanations delve into complicated details regarding ocean cycles and statistical methods without a clear
206 articulation of how these details relate to the key fact. The rebuttal does explain the fallacy of cherry picking committed by this
207 myth, the only rebuttal examined among both the top three and bottom three rebuttals that explicitly explains the fallacy.

?? maybe another is that some (probably mostly deniers)
come looking for arguments to support their denial

208 **4 Discussion**

209 Our experimental data shed light on the nature of Skeptical Science visitors with most visitors (66.5%) already agreeing with
210 climate facts, and 46.3% of visitors showing strong agreement with the fact or strong disagreement with the myth (Fig. 3).
211 Understanding the reason why these visitors come to the site is beyond the scope of this study (which we address further in the
212 discussion of limitations), but one possible interpretation is that a large proportion of visitors may be coming to the website not
213 because they were unsure about a particular climate fact or myth but because they were looking for information to assist them in
214 responding to climate misinformation (again, we clarify that we have collected no data to justify this interpretation). In analysing
215 comment threads on Skeptical Science, Metcalfe (2020) concluded that commenters seeking out like-minded users was an example
216 of “chanting to the choir.” However, a more constructive interpretation is that Skeptical Science content is “teaching the choir to
217 sing,” providing resources that empower people to respond to climate misinformation (Swim, Fraser, & Geiger, 2014). Such a
218 service is particularly important given that a major reason why people self-censor and avoid talking about climate change with
219 friends and family is due to fear of push-back from climate contrarians (Geiger & Swim 2016). This avoidance of climate change
220 as a discussion topic, known as climate silence, is self-reinforcing leading to a “spiral of silence” (Maibach et al., 2016). On the
221 other hand, discussing climate change raises awareness of the issue, which leads to more discussion in a positive feedback loop
222 (Goldberg et al., 2019).

Deleted: O
Deleted: of this result
Deleted: but

223 Also conflicting with the “chanting to the choir” interpretation is the finding that the greatest improvement in accurate perceptions
224 was observed among those with the strongest disagreement with climate facts or strongest agreement with climate myths. This was
225 an encouraging result, showing the website is effective in changing the minds of those most dismissive about climate change.
226 However, a concerning result was that overall, there was a decrease in agreement with climate facts. Inspection of the top three
227 and bottom three rebuttals offers insights into how rebuttals could be made more effective. The better performing rebuttals
228 identified relevant replacement facts that offered equal or greater explanatory relevance than the myths, explained clearly and
229 simply, while the worst performing rebuttals failed to clearly explain replacement facts. In addition, explicit explanations of the
230 fallacies used by climate myths should also be integrated into the rebuttals, offering a seamless fact-myth-fallacy debunking
231 structure (Lewandowsky et al., 2020). Currently, the website is being redesigned with plans to integrate fallacy explanations into

that

Thoughts (not intended for inclusion in your article, but you may take them if you wish and include them, probably expressed better than I have done here):

maybe related to that: (a) the speed of change now is faster than at any time in the past and (b) the pb is not so much temperature as such, but the facts that the speed of change is so fast human civilisation is not able to adapt and that the temperature make life difficult for humans - and of course nature

in other words, climate change is not a problem in itself, but a problem for life on Earth, esp humans, who created the problem, who talk about it (denying, agreeing, etc) and who study it
Without humans, climate change would not exist, whether or not temperature rises and the consequences wreak havoc

235 the updated content infrastructure and rebuttal design, in line with research showing the effectiveness of fallacy explanations (Cook
236 et al., 2017a). By incorporating existing resources documenting fallacies in climate misinformation (Cook et al., 2015; Cook et al.,
237 2018; Flack et al., 2024), it is expected that this might have a greater impact on lowering agreement with myths than on increasing
238 agreement with facts. Future research should assess the updated effectiveness of rebuttals that are more intentional in including
239 replacement facts and fallacy explanations.

240 One limitation of our study was the measurement of just one outcome variable: agreement with a fact/myth statement. Future
241 studies should aim to gain deeper insight into the impact of rebuttals on readers. One approach would be to collect open-ended
242 feedback from participants in the post-rebuttal survey. Qualitative data with the user reflecting on the readability or
243 comprehensibility of the rebuttal might offer guidance on potential problems with specific rebuttals. Questions specifically
244 targeting motivations could address more definitively why readers visited Skeptical Science, better informing the website creators
245 to meet readers' needs. Another limitation of this study is that it examined the impact of a single exposure to debunking text, a
246 challenging situation given that the effects of misinformation interventions decay over time (Maertens et al., 2025) while the public
247 are often exposed to multiple cases of misinformation over time. Unfortunately given the real-world field test aspect of this
248 research, with the corresponding lack of control over participant behaviour, addressing this limitation is beyond the scope of our
249 research capability.

250 However, controlled laboratory experiments are capable of addressing some of these limitations, such as testing the impact of
251 repeated exposure to corrective messages (Maertens et al., 2025) or offering messages that vary in a more controlled fashion to
252 avoid confounds (e.g., exposing participants to the same debunking with or without the presence of replacement facts and/or fallacy
253 explanations). In particular, controlled laboratory experiments can address the major weakness of field tests that rely on
254 convenience sampling, which is to provide participant samples that represent the general population. Such research design would
255 offer more generalizable findings for science communicators although in the case of this field test, the biased sample matched the
256 readership of the website so provided external validity for this research.

257 A key goal of misinformation interventions is to increase reader discernment, the difference between belief in facts and belief in
258 myths (Pennycook & Rand, 2021). While there was overall an increase in discernment, with the decrease in agreement with myths
259 greater than the decrease in agreement with facts, the result that belief in climate facts decreased for at least some rebuttals is
260 unwelcome and counter to the goal of Skeptical Science. A recent meta-analysis found that overall, inoculation against
261 misinformation increases discernment between reliable and unreliable news (Simchon et al., 2025).

262 A purely fact-based approach to debunking misinformation operates under the assumption of the information deficit model, which
263 assumes that public controversy about climate change can be resolved if enough information is supplied to people. This assumption
264 has been criticised as simplistic, resulting in ineffective climate communication (Suldovsky, 2017). Alternative approaches have
265 been proposed such as relationship-building between scientists and the public (Cook & Overpeck, 2019), participatory models
266 (Pearce et al., 2015), or the CAUSE model which has a strong emphasis on building credibility and establishing trust with target
267 audiences (Rowan et al., 2021). ~~Alternatively,~~ inoculation theory – and in particular, logic-based inoculation – offers a
268 psychological framework for reducing the influence of misinformation in a way that overcomes some of the cultural barriers such
269 as political ideology (Cook et al., 2017a). This underscores the importance of incorporating fallacy explanations in rebuttals, and
270 measuring their effectiveness in increasing reader discernment between facts and myths.

271 Lastly, the rebuttals examined in this study all focused on climate science myths, which has been a particular focus of Skeptical
272 Science to date. However, recent research indicates that climate misinformation is transitioning from science denial to arguments
273 against climate solutions (Coan et al., 2021), with increasing attention being paid to the so-called “discourses of delay” – framings
274 and narratives designed to delay climate action (Lamb et al., 2020). Further, solutions misinformation has been found to be one of
275 the most polarizing forms of climate misinformation, having a disproportionate effect on political conservatives (Lieu et al., in

please spell out

276 press). Due to this growing threat, Skeptical Science has recently begun incorporating more rebuttals of solutions myths. A
 277 collaboration with The Sabin Center for Climate Change Law at Columbia Law School involved adapting their rebuttals of 33
 278 renewable myths into Skeptical Science rebuttals (Eisenson et al., 2023). However, the effectiveness of rebuttals in response to
 279 solutions misinformation is understudied. Experimentally testing the impact of these rebuttals would be a useful area of future
 280 research.

281 In summary, collecting quantitative survey data on a live website is technically and scientifically challenging but offers the
 282 opportunity to gain deep insights into pre-existing and updated perceptions of visitors after reading website content. In this study,
 283 we obtained insights into climate perceptions of visitors as they arrived at the website. We also learned that our rebuttals decreased
 284 belief in climate myths and improved discernment – the difference between belief in facts and myths. However, we also observed
 285 a decrease in agreement with climate facts, an unwelcome result necessitating investigation into possible causes. In turn, the
 286 subsequent analysis offered guidance on ways that the rebuttals could be updated to be more effective, by including explanations
 287 of “replacement facts” that dislodge the myths being debunked, bringing the rebuttals in line with the recommendations of
 288 psychological research.

in which

289 **Appendix**

290 **A1 Table of Fact and Myth Statements**

delete vertical lines; put headings in bold

291 **Table A1: Factual and misinformation statements used in pre-rebuttal and post-rebuttal surveys.**

Myth	Factual Statement	Misinformation Statement
"It's cooling", "DMI show cooling Arctic"	I am certain that global warming is really happening.	The climate is not really warming.
"Ice isn't melting", "Arctic sea ice loss is matched by Antarctic sea ice gain"	Ice is melting at an accelerating rate.	Ice is not in danger of melting.
"We're heading into cooling", "We're heading into an ice age", "A grand solar minimum could trigger another ice age"	Earth's climate is headed into future warming.	Earth's climate is headed into another ice age.
"It's freaking cold!", "Record high snow cover was set in winter 2008/2009", "Record snowfall disproves global warming", "2009-2010 winter saw record cold spells"	Global warming makes hot days more likely and cold days less likely.	Recent cold weather is evidence that the climate is not warming
"No warming in 16 years", "Phil Jones says no global warming since 1995", "It hasn't warmed since 1998", "BEST hides the decline in global temperature", "IPCC admits global warming has paused", "They changed the name from 'global warming' to 'climate change'", "Oceans are cooling", "Springs aren't advancing", "Global warming stopped in 1998, 1995, 2002, 2007, 2010, ????", "Trenberth can't account for the lack of warming", "Satellites show no warming in the troposphere", "It's not happening"	Over the past few decades, the world's average temperature has been increasing.	Over the past few decades, the world's average temperature has not been increasing.
"Sea level rise is exaggerated", "Sea level rise is decelerating", "Sea level rise predictions are exaggerated", "Scientists retracted claim that sea levels are rising", "Sea level is not rising", "Sea level fell in 2010", "Tuvalu sea level isn't rising"	Sea level rise has been steadily accelerating over the past century.	The seriousness of sea level rise is exaggerated.
"Climate change isn't increasing extreme weather damage costs", "Extreme weather isn't caused by global warming", "Heatwaves have happened before", "Hurricanes aren't linked to global warming", "The connection between Hurricane Sandy and global warming"	Climate change is increasing the risk of extreme weather.	Extreme weather is not increasing, there is just more reporting of it in the media these days.
"There's no correlation between CO2 and temperature", "It's El Nino", "Animal agriculture and eating meat are the biggest causes of global warming", "It's methane", "It's microsite influences", "It's satellite"	Human activities are changing the climate	Climate change is just a result of natural

microwave transmissions", "Nuclear testing is causing global warming", "It's the ocean", "It's ozone", "It's Pacific Decadal Oscillation", "It's planetary movements", "It's a climate regime shift", "It's soot", "It's a climate shift step function caused by natural cycles", "Underground temperatures control climate", "It's internal variability", "A drop in volcanic activity caused warming", "It's waste heat"		variation in the climate.
"Mt. Kilimanjaro's ice loss is due to land use", "It's land use"	Most of the warming over the last 50 years is due to the increase in greenhouse gas concentrations	Climate change is due to non-greenhouse gas factors like land use.
"Greenhouse effect has been falsified", "Increasing CO2 has little to no effect", "There's no tropospheric hot spot", "We didn't have global warming during the Industrial Revolution", "CO2 was higher in the late Ordovician", "CO2 was higher in the past", "Postma disproved the greenhouse effect", "Removing all CO2 would make little difference", "CO2 has a short residence time", "CO2 effect is saturated", "2nd law of thermodynamics contradicts greenhouse theory", "CO2 is just a trace gas", "Water vapor is the most powerful greenhouse gas", "Venus doesn't have a runaway greenhouse effect"	Greenhouse gases in the atmosphere affect the average global temperature of the Earth.	Increasing greenhouse gases in the atmosphere has little to no effect on climate.
"Breathing contributes to CO2 buildup", "CO2 emissions do not correlate with CO2 concentration", "CO2 increase is natural, not human-caused", "Murry Salby finds CO2 rise is natural"	CO2 emissions from fossil fuel burning have caused atmospheric CO2 levels to increase by over 40%.	CO2 emissions from fossil fuel burning is not the cause of the increase in CO2 levels in the atmosphere.
"It's only a few degrees", "It's not bad", "An exponential increase in CO2 will result in a linear increase in temperature", "It's not urgent"	The effects of climate change are likely to be catastrophic.	I do not believe climate change is a real problem.
"Clouds provide negative feedback", "Humidity is falling", "Infrared Iris will reduce global warming", "Lindzen and Choi find low climate sensitivity", "No long tail means climate sensitivity is low", "Roy Spencer finds negative feedback", "Positive feedback means runaway warming", "Schmittner finds low climate sensitivity", "Climate sensitivity is low", "Water vapor in the stratosphere stopped global warming", "Tropical thermostat limits sea surface temperature to 30C"	The climate is highly sensitive to changes in heat.	Negative feedbacks mean climate sensitivity is low.
"Animals and plants can adapt"	Global warming will harm animal and plant species.	Global warming is no danger to animal and plant species.
"CO2 is not a pollutant"	Rising carbon dioxide in the atmosphere presents a danger to people and the environment.	Carbon dioxide is natural; therefore, it is safe.
"Adapting to global warming is cheaper than preventing it", "It's too hard"	Humans can reduce global warming, and we are going to do so successfully.	Humans can't reduce global warming, even if it is happening.
"CO2 limits will harm the economy", "Renewable energy investment kills jobs", "CO2 limits will hurt the poor"	The economic benefits of climate action outweigh the costs.	Climate action is bad for the economy.
"CO2 limits won't cool the planet"	With strong climate action, we can make significant impact on slowing climate change.	Climate action will have little impact on slowing climate change.
"Renewables can't provide baseload power", "Renewable energy is too expensive"	We need many different strategies to reduce CO2 emissions and avoid climate change.	Renewable technology like solar power cannot help us reduce global warming.
"Climate 'Skeptics' are like Galileo", "The science isn't settled"	There is a strong body of evidence for climate change.	The evidence for climate change is unreliable.

"CO2 measurements are suspect", "Tree-rings diverge from temperature after 1960", "Dropped stations introduce warming bias", "Satellite error inflated Great Lakes temperatures", "Hockey stick is broken", "Ljungqvist broke the hockey stick", "Mauna Loa is a volcano", "Satellite record is more reliable than thermometers", "Plant stomata show higher and more variable CO2 levels", "Temp record is unreliable", "UAH atmospheric temperatures prove climate models and/or surface temperature data sets are wrong", "It's Urban Heat Island effect"	Climate measurements are accurate.	Climate measurements are unreliable.
"Climategate CRU emails suggest conspiracy", "Scientists tried to 'hide the decline' in global temperature", "Freedom of Information (FOI) requests were ignored", "Climate scientists are in it for the money", "Climate science peer review is pal review", "Peer review process was corrupted", "CRU tampered with temperature data"	Climate scientists are sincere in their research into climate.	Climate change is a hoax to generate money for scientists.
"Antarctica is gaining ice", "Southern sea ice is increasing", "Antarctica is too cold to lose ice"	Antarctica is losing land ice at an accelerating rate, contributing to sea level rise.	Antarctica is gaining ice, casting doubt on global warming.
"Greenland is gaining ice", "Greenland ice sheet won't collapse", "Greenland has only lost a tiny fraction of its ice mass", "Ice Sheet losses are overestimated"	Greenland is losing ice at an accelerating rate.	Greenland is not in danger of melting.
"Melting ice isn't warming the Arctic", "Arctic sea ice has recovered", "Arctic icemelt is a natural cycle", "Arctic Storm Caused the 2012 Record Sea Ice Minimum"	Arctic sea ice is in long-term retreat, losing half its coverage in only 40 years.	Arctic sea ice is not in danger of melting.
"Glaciers are growing", "Himalayan glaciers are not shrinking"	Glaciers are in long-term retreat.	Glaciers are not in danger of melting.
"The sun is getting hotter", "Solar Cycle Length proves its the sun", "Solar cycles cause global warming", "It's the sun", "Water levels correlate with sunspots", "Jupiter is warming", "Mars is warming", "Neptune is warming", "Other planets are warming", "Pluto is warming"	Over the last few decades of global warming, the sun has been cooling and cannot be causing recent warming.	Other planets showing warming means the sun is causing global warming.
"It's a 1500 year cycle", "CO2 only causes 35% of global warming", "It's aerosols", "It's not us", "Akasofu Proved Global Warming is Just a Recovery from the Little Ice Age", "It's albedo", "It's global brightening", "CERN CLOUD experiment proved cosmic rays are causing global warming", "It's CFCs", "It's cosmic rays", "It's a natural cycle", "CO2 is not the only driver of climate", "There's no empirical evidence", "Greenland was green", "We're coming out of the Little Ice Age", "Loehle and Scafetta find a 60 year cycle causing global warming", "It cooled mid-century", "Medieval Warm Period was warmer", "Northwest passage has been navigated in the past", "Climate's changed before", "It warmed before 1940 when CO2 was low", "Humans are too insignificant to affect global climate", "Soares finds lack of correlation between CO2 and temperature", "Humans survived past climate changes", "It warmed just as fast in 1860-1880 and 1910-1940"	Most of the warming over the last 50 years is due to the increase in greenhouse gas concentrations.	The climate is always changing and what we are currently observing is just natural fluctuation.
"Most of the last 10,000 years were warmer", "1934 - hottest year on record", "Arctic was warmer in 1940"	Modern climate change is abrupt and driven by human activity, setting it apart from past climate change.	It's been hotter in the past, therefore humans are not the cause of current global warming.
"CO2 lags temperature"	More CO2 causes more warming and warming causes more CO2, combining to create a reinforcing feedback.	CO2 lagged temperature in the past, disproving the warming effect of CO2.
"Human CO2 is a tiny % of CO2 emissions", "CO2 is coming from the ocean", "Volcanoes emit more CO2 than humans", "Warming causes CO2 rise"	CO2 emissions from fossil fuel burning have upset the carbon cycle which was in natural balance.	Nature produces more carbon dioxide than humans.
"CO2 is not increasing"	CO2 emissions from fossil fuel burning have caused atmospheric CO2 levels to increase by over 40%.	CO2 levels in the atmosphere are not increasing appreciably.
"Polar bear numbers are increasing"	Global warming will	Global warming is no

	harm polar bears.	danger to polar bears.
"Ocean acidification isn't serious", "Coral atolls grow as sea levels rise", "Corals are resilient to bleaching", "Great Barrier Reef is in good shape"	Global warming will harm ocean ecosystems.	Global warming is no danger to ocean ecosystems
"CO2 is plant food"	Plants need the right amount of water to flourish - climate change upsets that balance.	CO2 is plant food so CO2 emissions are good for plants.
"500 scientists refute the consensus", "There is no consensus", "Deniers are part of the 97%", "The IPCC consensus is phoney", "Over 31,000 scientists signed the OISM Petition Project", "Naomi Oreskes' study on consensus was flawed", "97% consensus on human-caused global warming has been disproven", "Royal Society embraces skepticism", "Less than half of published scientists endorse global warming"	Most climate scientists agree human activity is causing global warming.	There is a lot of disagreement among climate scientists about whether human activity is causing global warming.
"Earth hasn't warmed as much as expected", "Models are unreliable", "Climate is chaotic and cannot be predicted", "Scientists can't even predict weather"	Climate models have been successful at predicting global warming over long time periods.	Scientists' computer models are too unreliable to predict the climate of the future.
"Ice age predicted in the 70s"	Most climate research in the 1970s predicted future global warming.	Scientists were wrong about ice age predictions in the 1970s so can't be trusted now.
"Al Gore got it wrong"	Al Gore is trustworthy in how he treats climate research.	Al Gore is not trustworthy in how he treats climate research.
"Hansen's 1988 prediction was wrong", "Hansen predicted the West Side Highway would be underwater"	Climate scientists are trustworthy in how they do climate research.	Climate scientists are not trustworthy in how they do climate research.
"IPCC graph showing accelerating trends is misleading", "IPCC were wrong about Amazon rainforests", "IPCC human-caused global warming attribution confidence is unfounded", "IPCC were wrong about Himalayan glaciers", "IPCC disappeared the Medieval Warm Period", "IPCC edited out natural causes of climate change", "Skeptics were kept out of the IPCC?", "IPCC overestimate temperature rise", "IPCC global warming projections were wrong", "Ben Santer rewrote the 1995 IPCC report", "IPCC is alarmist"	The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) is trustworthy in how they treat climate research.	The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) is not trustworthy in how they treat climate research.

292 **A2 Handbooks**

293 **The Debunking Handbook**

294 Skeptical Science also provides downloadable materials such as handbooks devoted to various aspects of misinformation research.
 295 The **Debunking Handbook** is a consensus document written by 19 co-authors invited by the three lead authors Stephan
 296 Lewandowsky, John Cook and Ullrich Ecker based on their scientific status in the field. The Handbook explains what mis- and
 297 disinformation is, why it can cause substantial harm for individuals and societies, why it is often sticky and therefore hard to
 298 dislodge, why pre-bunking can be more effective than debunking and how to go about the latter best. As of July 2025, this handbook
 299 has been translated into 20 languages.

300 Cite: Lewandowsky, S., Cook, J., Ecker, U. K. H., Albarracín, D., Amazeen, M. A., Kendeou, P., Lombardi, D., Newman, E. J.,
 301 Pennycook, G., Porter, E. Rand, D. G., Rapp, D. N., Reifler, J., Roozenbeek, J., Schmid, P., Seifert, C. M., Sinatra, G. M., Swire-
 302 Thompson, B., van der Linden, S., Vraga, E. K., Wood, T. J., Zaragoza, M. S. (2020). *The Debunking Handbook 2020*. Available
 303 at <https://sks.to/db2020>. DOI:10.17910/b7.1182

italics

304 **The Conspiracy Theory Handbook**

305 Conspiracy theories attempt to explain events as the secretive plots of powerful people. While conspiracy theories are not typically
306 supported by evidence, this doesn't stop them from blossoming. Conspiracy theories damage society in a number of ways. To help
307 minimize these harmful effects, ~~The Conspiracy Theory Handbook~~ written by Stephan Lewandowsky and John Cook explains
308 why conspiracy theories are so popular, how to identify the traits of conspiratorial thinking, and what effective response strategies
309 are. As of July 2025, this handbook has been translated into 20 languages. The Handbook distills the most important research
310 findings and expert advice on dealing with conspiracy theories. It also introduces the abbreviation CONSPIR which serves as a
311 mnemonic to more easily remember the seven traits of conspiratorial thinking: They are contradictory, contain overriding
312 suspicion, have nefarious intent, something must be wrong, peddlers of conspiracy theories see themselves as persecuted victims,
313 they are immune to evidence and are re-interpreting randomness.

314 Cite: Lewandowsky, S., & Cook, J. (2020). The Conspiracy Theory Handbook. Available at <https://sks.to/conspiracy>

315 **A3 Massive Open Online Course: Denial101x**

316 In 2015, the Skeptical Science team in collaboration with the University of Queensland produced a Massive Open Online Course
317 (MOOC) titled Denial101x: Making Sense of Climate Science Denial (Cook et al., 2017b; Winkler & Cook, 2021), which ran from
318 April 2015 to February 2024. Included the fact-myth-fallacy resource (published at sks.to/fmf).

319 **A4 Translations**

320 In 2009, translation capabilities for rebuttals were added to the website and since then, 1086 translations have been published in
321 25 languages by volunteer translators. For some languages there are less than 5 translations while others have up to 213. Table A2
322 shows the top 15 languages by number of published translations.

323 **Table A2. Number of Translations into each Language.**

Language	Translations
German	213
Italian	136
Russian	108
Portuguese	99
Indonesian	60
Slovenian	60
Hebrew	58
Finnish	52
Polish	46
Czech	37
Spanish	35


Hungarian	27
Japanese	25
Dutch	23
Icelandic	17

324

325 **A5 Conference presentations**

326 Winkler, B., Cook, J. (2020). [The story of Skeptical Science: How citizen science helped to turn a website into a go-to](#)
 327 [resource for climate science](#). EGU 2020.

328 Winkler, B. and Cook, J.: [Using an interdisciplinary MOOC to teach climate science and science communication to a](#)
 329 [global classroom](#), EGU General Assembly 2021, online, 19–30 Apr 2021, EGU21-8576,
 330 <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-egu21-8576>, 2021. [PDF](#)

331  **A6 Links to Skeptical Science Content and Resources**

332 **A6.1 Skeptical Science content**

333 Website - <https://skepticalscience.com>

334 Evolution from 2007 to 2017 - <https://skepticalscience.com/SkepticalScience-10-Birthday.html>

335 Activities 2017 - <https://skepticalscience.com/2017-SkS-Review.html>

336 Activities 2018 - <https://skepticalscience.com/2018-SkS-Review.html>

337 Activities 2019 - <https://skepticalscience.com/2019-SkS-Review.html>

338 Activities 2020 - <https://skepticalscience.com/2020-SkS-Review.html>

339 Activities 2021 - <https://skepticalscience.com/2021-SkS-Review.html>

340 Activities 2022 - <https://skepticalscience.com/2022-SkS-Review.html>

341 Activities 2023 - <https://skepticalscience.com/2023-SkS-Review.html>

342 Activities 2024 - <https://skepticalscience.com/2024-SkS-Review.html>

343 List of arguments - <https://skepticalscience.com/argument.php>

344 Taxonomy of arguments - <https://skepticalscience.com/argument.php?f=taxonomy>

345 With fixed numbers - <https://skepticalscience.com/fixnum.php>

346 Announcing the 3 rebuttal levels - [https://skepticalscience.com/Plain-English-climate-science-now-live-at-Skeptical-](https://skepticalscience.com/Plain-English-climate-science-now-live-at-Skeptical-Science.html)
 347 [Science.html](#)

348 Rebuttal updates project - <https://skepticalscience.com/rebuttal-update-project.html>

349 Collaboration with the Sabin Center for Climate Change Law - <https://skepticalscience.com/rebutting-33-false-claims-about-solar-wind-ev-introduction.html>

351 FLICC-techniques of science denial - <https://skepticalscience.com/history-FLICC-5-techniques-science-denial.html>

352 **A6.2 Myths and Rebuttals Referenced**

353 It's not happening - <https://skepticalscience.com/evidence-for-global-warming.htm>

354 It's not us - <https://skepticalscience.com/its-not-us.htm>

355 It's not bad - <https://skepticalscience.com/global-warming-positives-negatives.htm>

356 It's too hard - <https://skepticalscience.com/global-warming-too-hard.htm>

357 CO2 was higher in the past - basic - <https://skepticalscience.com/co2-higher-in-past-basic.htm>

358 CO2 was higher in the past - intermediate - <https://skepticalscience.com/co2-higher-in-past-intermediate.htm>

359 Water vapor is the most powerful greenhouse gas - <https://skepticalscience.com/water-vapor-greenhouse-gas.htm>



361 It's albedo - <https://skepticalscience.com/earth-albedo-effect.htm>

362 CO2-effect is saturated - <https://skepticalscience.com/saturated-co2-effect.htm>

363 It's cooling - <https://skepticalscience.com/global-cooling.htm>

364 There is no consensus - <https://skepticalscience.com/global-warming-scientific-consensus.htm>

365 **A7 Reading time/speed distributions**



366


367 **Figure A1. a) Reading time distribution (seconds). b) Reading speed distribution (words per minute).**

368 **Data Availability**

369 Anonymised data has been uploaded to <https://osf.io/jnce4/>

370 **Author Contributions**

371 JC and BW contributed data analysis and writing of results. CM, TL, DB contributed descriptions of experimental implementation.
372 DN contributed writing of manuscript.



373 **Competing interests**

374 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

375 **Ethical statement**

376 This study was conducted with ethics approval obtained from the George Mason University Institutional Review Board (IRBNet
377 number: 1379945-1).

378 **Special issue statement**

379 This paper was submitted to a special issue of *Geoscience Communication* on the theme of **Climate and ocean education and
380 communication: Practice, ethics and urgency.**

381 **Acknowledgements**

382 The Skeptical Science team acknowledges the tireless contributions of John Mason who led the revision of rebuttals and addition
383 of the 'At a Glance' sections.

384 **References**

385 Bedford, D., & Cook, J. (2013). Agnotology, scientific consensus, and the teaching and learning of climate change: A response to
386 Legates, Soon and Briggs. *Science & Education*, 22(8), 2019-2030.

387 Bentley, A. P., Petcovic, H. L., Cassidy, D. P., & Eklund, P. R. (2016, December). The Relationship between Anthropogenic
388 Climate Change Acceptance and Agreement with Authentic Dissenter Messages. In AGU Fall Meeting Abstracts (Vol.
389 2016, pp. ED33D-0909).

390 Cook, B. R., & Overpeck, J. T. (2019). Relationship-building between climate scientists and publics as an alternative to information
391 transfer. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, 10(2), e570.

392 Coan, T. G., Boussalis, C., Cook, J., & Nanko, M. O. (2021). Computer-assisted classification of contrarian claims about climate
393 change. *Scientific Reports*, 11(1), 22320.

394 Cook, J., Ellerton, P., & Kinkead, D. (2018). Deconstructing climate misinformation to identify reasoning errors. *Environmental*
395 *Research Letters*, 11(2).

396 Cook, J., Lewandowsky, S., & Ecker, U. (2017a). Neutralizing misinformation through inoculation: Exposing misleading
397 argumentation techniques reduces their influence. *PLOS ONE*, 12(5): e0175799.

398 Cook, J., Nuccitelli, D., Green, S.A., Richardson, M., Winkler, B., Painting, R., Way, R., Jacobs, P., & Skuce, A. (2013).
399 Quantifying the consensus on anthropogenic global warming in the scientific literature. *Environmental Research Letters*,
400 8(2), 024024+.

401 Cook, J., Oreskes, N., Doran, P. T., Anderegg, W. R. L., Verheggen, B., Maibach, E. W., Carlton, J.S., Lewandowsky, S., Green,
402 S. A., Skuce, A. G., Nuccitelli, D., Jacobs, P., Richardson, M., Winkler, B., Painting, R., Rice, K. (2016). Consensus on
403 consensus: a synthesis of consensus estimates on human-caused global warming. *Environmental Research Letters*, 11(4),
404 048002.

405 Cook, J., Schuennemann, K., Nuccitelli, D., Jacobs, P., Cowtan, K., Green, S., Way, R., Richardson, M., Cawley, G., Mandia, S.,
406 Skuce, A. & Bedford, D. (2015). Denial101x: Making sense of climate science denial. *edX*. Retrieved from
407 <http://edx.org/understanding-climate-denial>.

408 Cook, J., Winkler, B., Finn, C., & Dodgen, T. (2017b, January). Challenges and learning opportunities in a controversial MOOC
409 forum on climate science denial. In *10th International Conference of Education, Research and Innovation (Iceri2017)*
410 (pp. 3460-3468). IATED Academy.

411 Ecker, U. K., Lewandowsky, S., & Tang, D. T. (2010). Explicit warnings reduce but do not eliminate the continued influence of
412 misinformation. *Memory & Cognition*, 38(8), 1087-1100.

413 Eisenson, M., Elkin, J., Fitch, A., Ard, M., Sittinger, K., Lavine, S. (2023). Rebutting 33 false claims about solar, wind, and electric
414 vehicles. *Sabin Center for Climate Change Law*. <https://climate.law.columbia.edu/news/sabin-center-releases-new-report-rebutting-33-false-claims-about-solar-wind-and-electric> .

415

416 Elsasser, S. W., & Dunlap, R. E. (2013). Leading voices in the denier choir: Conservative columnists' dismissal of global warming
417 and denigration of climate science. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 57(6), 754-776.

418 Flack, R., Cook, J., Ellerton, P., Kinkead, D., Coan, T., Boussalis, C., Nanko, M. O., Gallant, A., Dargaville, R. (2024). Identifying
419 Flawed Reasoning in Contrarian Claims about Climate Change. *Online at <https://osf.io/preprints/psyarxiv/tk76c>*

420 Geiger, N., & Swim, J. K. (2016). Climate of silence: Pluralistic ignorance as a barrier to climate change discussion. *Journal of*
421 *Environmental Psychology*, 47, 79-90.

422 Goldberg, M. H., van der Linden, S., Maibach, E., & Leiserowitz, A. (2019). Discussing global warming leads to greater acceptance
423 of climate science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(30), 14804-14805.

424 Hansson, S. O. (2017). Science denial as a form of pseudoscience. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part A*, 63, 39-47.

425 Jolley, D., & Douglas, K. M. (2014). The social consequences of conspiracism: Exposure to conspiracy theories decreases
426 intentions to engage in politics and to reduce one's carbon footprint. *British Journal of Psychology*, 105(1), 35-56.

427 Lamb, W. F., Mattioli, G., Levi, S., Roberts, J. T., Capstick, S., Creutzig, F., Minx, J. C., Müller-Hansen, F., Culhane, T., &
428 Steinberger, J. K. (2020). Discourses of climate delay. *Global Sustainability*, 3, e17.

429 Leiserowitz, A., Smith, N., & Marlon, J. R. (2011). American teens' knowledge of climate change. Yale University. New Haven,
430 CT: Yale Project on Climate Change Communication, 5.

431 Lewandowsky, S., Cook, J., Ecker, U. K. H., Albarracín, D., Amazeen, M. A., Kendeou, P., Lombardi, D., Newman, E. J.,
432 Pennycook, G., Porter, E. Rand, D. G., Rapp, D. N., Reifler, J., Roozenbeek, J., Schmid, P., Seifert, C. M., Sinatra, G.
433 M., Swire-Thompson, B., van der Linden, S., Vraga, E. K., Wood, T. J., Zaragoza, M. S. (2020). *The Debunking*
434 *Handbook 2020*. <https://doi.org/10.17910/b7.1182>

435 Lewandowsky, S., Oreskes, N., Risbey, J. S., Newell, B. R., & Smithson, M. (2015). Seepage: Climate change denial and its effect
436 on the scientific community. *Global Environmental Change*, 33, 1-13.

437 Lieu, R., Hayes, O. R., Cook, J. (in press). Testing the impact of fallacies and contrarian claims in climate change misinformation.
438 *British Journal of Psychology*.

439 Ling, M., Head, A., & Clarke, E. J. R. (2019). Validation of a Novel Climate Change Denial Measure Using Item Response Theory.
440 <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/57nbk>

441 Maibach, E., Leiserowitz, A., Rosenthal, S., Roser-Renouf, C & Cutler, M 2016, *Is There a Climate "Spiral of Silence" in America:*
442 *March, 2016*, Yale Program on Climate Change Communication, New Haven, CT.

443 Maertens, R., Roozenbeek, J., Simons, J. S., Lewandowsky, S., Maturo, V., Goldberg, B., ... & van der Linden, S. (2025).
444 Psychological booster shots targeting memory increase long-term resistance against misinformation. *Nature*
445 *Communications*, 16(1), 2062.

446 McCright, A. M., Charters, M., Dentzman, K., & Dietz, T. (2016). Examining the effectiveness of climate change frames in the
447 face of a climate change denial counter-frame. *Topics in cognitive science*, 8(1), 76-97.

448 McCuin, J. L., Hayhoe, K., & Hayhoe, D. (2014). Comparing the Effects of Traditional vs. Misconceptions-Based Instruction on
449 Student Understanding of the Greenhouse Effect. *Journal of Geoscience Education*, 62(3), 445-459.

450 Metcalfe, J. (2020). Chanting to the choir: the dialogical failure of antithetical climate change blogs. *Journal of Science*
451 *Communication*, 19(2), A04.

452 Modirrousta-Galian, A., & Higham, P. A. (2023). Gamified inoculation interventions do not improve discrimination between true
453 and fake news: Reanalyzing existing research with receiver operating characteristic analysis. *Journal of Experimental*
454 *Psychology: General*, 152(9), 2411.

455 Pearce, W., Brown, B., Nerlich, B., & Koteyko, N. (2015). Communicating climate change: Conduits, content, and consensus.
456 *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, 6(6), 613-626.

457 Pennycook, G., Cannon, T. D., & Rand, D. G. (2018). Prior exposure increases perceived accuracy of fake news. *Journal of*
458 *Experimental Psychology: General*, 147(12), 1865.

459 Ranney, M.A. & Clark, D. (2016). Climate Change Conceptual Change: Scientific Information Can Transform Attitudes. *Topics*
460 *in Cognitive Science*, 8(1), 49-75.

461 Rowan, K. E., Engblom, A., Hathaway, J., Lloyd, R., Vorster, I., Anderson, E. Z., & Akerlof, K. L. (2021). Overcome the deficit
462 model by applying the CAUSE model to climate change communication. *The Handbook of Strategic Communication*,
463 225-261.

- 464 Schwarz, N., Newman, E., & Leach, W. (2016). Making the truth stick & the myths fade: Lessons from cognitive psychology.
465 *Behavioral Science & Policy*, 2(1), 85-95.
- 466 Seifert, C. M. (2002). The continued influence of misinformation in memory: What makes a correction effective? In *Psychology*
467 *of learning and motivation* (Vol. 41, pp. 265-292). Academic Press.
- 468 Simchon, A., Zipori, T., Teitelbaum, L., Lewandowsky, S., & van der Linden, S. (2025). A Signal Detection Theory Meta-Analysis
469 of Psychological Inoculation Against Misinformation. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 102194.
- 470 Suldovsky, B. (2017). The information deficit model and climate change communication. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of*
471 *Climate Science*. Oxford University Press.
- 472 Swim, J. K., Fraser, J., & Geiger, N. (2014). Teaching the choir to sing: Use of social science information to promote public
473 discourse on climate change. *Journal of Land Use & Environmental Law*, 91-117.
- 474 van der Linden, S. (2015). The conspiracy-effect: Exposure to conspiracy theories (about global warming) decreases pro-social
475 behavior and science acceptance. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 87, 171-173.
- 476 van der Linden, S., Leiserowitz, A., Rosenthal, S., & Maibach, E. (2017). Inoculating the Public against Misinformation about
477 Climate Change. *Global Challenges*, 1(2), 1600008.
- 478 Vraga, E. K., Kim, S. C., Cook, J., & Bode, L. (2020). Testing the effectiveness of correction placement and type on Instagram.
479 *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 25(4), 632-652.
- 480 Winkler, B. and Cook, J. (2021). Using an interdisciplinary MOOC to teach climate science and science communication to a global
481 classroom, EGU General Assembly 2021, online, 19–30 Apr 2021, EGU21-8576, [https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-](https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-egu21-8576)
482 [egu21-8576](https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-egu21-8576). PDF
- 483 Zainurrahman, Z., Yusuf, F. N., & Sukyadi, D. (2024). Text readability: its impact on reading comprehension and reading time.
484 *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn)*, 18(4), 1422-1432.
- 485 Zanartu, F., Cook, J., Frermann, L., Otmakhova, Y. (2024). Generative Debunking of Climate Misinformation. *ClimateNLP 2024*
486 *Workshop*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.05599>