

## **Response to Editor's Comments to the authors:**

### **"Disentangling the Climate Divide with Emotional Patterns: a Network-Based Mindset Reconstruction Approach".**

Dear Hermann, Dear Editor,

Thanks for inviting us to submit an improved version of our manuscript. Let us express our gratitude for your comments and suggestions about our manuscript along the phases of the revision process, we next respond to your recent of suggestions in a comment-by-comment basis.

#### **Editor's Comment #1.**

What does a study based on 2 cases only, really tell us? I expect that you clearer relate your work to work also dealing with small sample sizes in that field. The exploratory character of your study in conjunction with the conceptual and/or methodological advancement must be framed clearer.

Response:

Thanks, we now deal with this suggestion in the introduction, in the methods, and in the discussion, thus fully integrating your suggestions with those of the referees.

In the introduction, we highlight our conceptual and methodological advancement, and mention the exploratory nature of the methods.

In the methodology, we now additionally cite a similar work that deal with limited sample sizes, e.g. a paper co-authored by Stella on a limited set of short suicide notes, consisting roughly of 120 words each.

Finally, in the discussion, we suggest augmenting the number of actors analyzed and capturing regional diversity.

We firmly believe that within the limited scope of our objectives this work has provided answers to our enquiry, and that we are being fully transparent about its limitations.

#### **Editor's Comment #2.**

The methodology as such remains opaque, to a certain extent. Please do not only cite previous work (as you did), but distill the essence from it in your ms.

Response:

Thanks, we have extensively clarified the methodology and doubled its size with full information, even detailing what has been used and how, to the absolutely detailed level of commands within known software brands (e.g. Mathematica). While avoiding turning the manuscript into an annotated bibliography, we have been able to incorporate your suggestion by improving the connection between citations to previous work and our work. We elaborated on what they mean and how they constitute a basis for the present work. We feel the methodology is fully unpacked, even at a higher level of detail than what is usually required in a scientific paper, and we find this positive as it helps to get the message in the paper clearer.

### **Editor's Comment #3.**

Please also consider the other comments by the reviewers when preparing a new ms.

Response:

Thanks, we have done so thoroughly, responding to all reviewers' suggestions by incorporating their valuable insights on a comment by comment basis. Now the manuscript incorporates both their suggestions — covered in an earlier response letter — and your suggestions.

Once more, we would like to thank you for your help on improving this manuscript, and for providing us with an example of good editorial practices.

Best regards,

Roger Cremades and Massimo Stella.