

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

Justas Kažys¹

¹ Vilnius University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

[1][2][3] Yes, it is true, the title says everything, so you do not need to open the article, nevertheless you are 'climate believer' and you need scientifically proofed information. I found the article too technical and does not provide any deeper analysis of noun-words, relations, preconditions, etc.

The article deals with climate change denial and skepticism topic. However, the hypothesis and does not fully support the differences. Why does in some hypotheses there are no differences in 'deniers' and 'believers' in some redsits?

Every time we want to proof something we usually refer to previous findings and, nowadays internet is the main source of information. There is nothing wrong to research online comments and people's behavior. However, the research is too much consternating on non-existent things; I am absolutely sure that, there are no any 'climate' or 'climate change' or '-believers' / '-deniers' in the internet, there are only various thoughts opinions and predispositions, etc. The real things are happening here and now. I will be more than happy that every denier would spend the whole day on finding these supportive materials in 'biased sources' and do nothing practical in life.

Moreover, putting the world into YES and NO position makes the article too flat. Am I 'climate change believer', absolutely not, I am a person, who works with climate change topic, and climate change as 'a thing' could be fundament of the research, what could help supporting hypotheses and keeping believes or non-believes aside.

The discussion part should be including more: what is denial itself, should be any reaction to denialism and how much is harmful /prosperous for some kind of commenters? Are online media and academic journals being as much reliable sources of information as they are presented?

References

- ¹ John Cook, Peter Ellerton, David Kinkead. (2018). *Deconstructing climate misinformation to identify reasoning errors*. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, vol. 13 (2), 024018. doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aaa49f.
- ² John Cook. (2020). *Deconstructing climate science denial*. doi:10.4337/9781789900408.00014.
- ³ Kathie M. d'I. Treen, Hywel T. P. Williams, Saffron J. O'Neill. (2020). *Online misinformation about climate change*.



WIREs Clim Change, vol. 11 (5). doi:10.1002/wcc.665.