

Review of: "Motivated Reasoning Leads Climate Change Deniers to Access Unreliable Online Sources of Information: Automated Text Analyses of Multiple Reddit Communities"

Beatriz Cosendey

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This is a very interesting paper that statistically depicts a common profile of society nowadays, where issues are discussed or denied without a logical basis for it. In this way, understanding the reasons of the refuse of new information and ways of dealing with this behavior can improve the dissemination of scientific knowledge among society. The present paper approaches this topic, focusing on a very important subject such as the climatic crises. So, in my opinion, it is an article worth publishing, either because of the main theme of the research, or because it is a concise and well-written article that not only identifies problems but also proposes solutions to solve them. I have just some suggestions to do, as follows:

1. Would it be possible to draw the sampling design of the nationality of the comments? I think it would be very interesting to know if they came from different parts of the globe or from the same country.
2. The text says that the first 17 domains were analyzed. Why 17? Was it random or was there a cutoff criterion?
3. The third paragraph of the methodology says: "The distinction between the categories of journalistic media and blog was based on (a)..." missing a "(b)" for the second proposal.
4. In the same paragraph above, when discussing the domains of the news media, it is said that the media did not have a stated political ideology. I didn't understand if this was stipulated as a consensus for all media channels (just for being news domains) or if the domains analyzed did not have a political aspect. As is known, being a news media does not exempt the source from bias.
5. Table 1 shows 18 domains but the text mentions 17.
6. The "Results" section starts inside table 1 (in gray); correct formatting.
7. The analysis used must be described in material and methods, not just in the results section. It is important to show which analyzes were used and how they were performed before the results.
8. In my opinion, it would be preferable to say that the 4th hypothesis was partially confirmed, as it is written in observation 4, instead of saying that it was confirmed, as it is in the text. Since the percentage of the *Climate Change* community is already higher than the *Skeptics* community, it is expected that adding the *Climate Action Plan* (or any other data) this percentage will stand out. So, it might be considered a bit far-fetched to say that hypothesis 4 was confirmed based on that. I suggest rewriting this paragraph to place less emphasis on the initial confirmation of the hypothesis. Another thing is, considering the *Climate Change* community a community of believers can represent a

bias since in this way two groups in favor and one against would be analyzed in the sample. The ideal would be if it were one against, one for, and one neutral.