**Virginia Kotzias – Copy editing:**

A few general comments:

* Although it isn't incorrect grammar, there's a heavy favoritism toward leading each sentence with a subordinate clause. Rather than saying "We will leave if it rains," the sentence reads "If it rains, we will leave." Stringing together several sentences that are constructed in this way can give the reader a sense of whiplash because English tends to favor leading a sentence with the subject first. I made some edits to adjust the rhythm of the paper with this in mind, but note that it's a style/voice issue and is optional.
* Similar to the first point, there were several instances where the modifier or descriptor of a given noun or clause was reversed (e.g. "My cup" vs "the cup of me"). I flipped them around.
* Parentheses and dashes, both used to indicate an "aside" in writing, are not directly interchangeable. I've changed them in accordance with the criteria provided [here](https://www.quickanddirtytips.com/education/grammar/dashes-parentheses-and-commas).
* ["Less" and "fewer"](https://www.merriam-webster.com/words-at-play/fewer-vs-less#:~:text='Fewer'%20and%20'Less'&text=Generally%2C%20fewer%20is%20used%20when,or%20%22less%20time%22).) are not interchangeable, though casual English speakers confuse them all the time. "Less" is used when you have a continuum of an amount of something (e.g. "less water in the lake"), whereas "fewer" is used when you have units of something (e.g. "fewer liters of water in the lake").
* There were extraneous uses of fillers like "also" and "especially," which I removed to improve clarity.
* Check the references/citations and the footnote situation. I made comments on things that seemed out of sorts.

**Melanie Magin – supervisory feedback:**

1. I was wondering what the theoretical contribution of your paper is. You have a clear focus on your empirical study, but the theoretical part is somewhat underdeveloped, and I miss a clarification of what exactly the theoretical contribution should be. (I mention that also because that probably belongs to the top 3 comments of all reviewers in our field. 😉)
2. I was struggling a bit with the structure of your paper and the understandability what exactly you have done.  
     
   First of all, I think it might be a good idea to mention in the abstract and in the introduction that you are conducting an automated/computational analysis. You actually don’t mention that a single time in your paper. 😉 And if you don’t describe your analyses (what exactly you have done, how you ran your analyses…), your paper lacks transparency. That will most probably be criticized.  
     
   Second, I was a bit confused that the whole theory part and literature review happens in the introduction. You know that I’m not a political scientist, so I’m not quite sure if that is common in political science, but the structure of your paper looks more like the computer science papers I know – with an introduction sketching the relevance and then directly starting with explaining the method. Is that how it is meant to be?  
     
   Third, I was confused that you didn’t explain your operationalizations in the methods section. Then I found them in the results section, but was struggling to understand why you chose exactly these because you didn’t introduce them in the theory section. So why do you investigate understandability and the use of multimedia elements, and how do these relate? And how do these relate to the existing studies from these strands of research?
3. When I reached chapter 4, I was completely surprised to read that you also analyze user engagement indicators. You did not mention that in the paper until that point, neither is it addressed in your research questions. Your whole paper is about the communication strategies of EU actors – until chapter 4 where suddenly user engagement pops up. To be honest, I don’t understand why you include that. The paper would increase in clarity if you leave this part out, and you would have more space for deepening the other parts. If you want to keep it, you need to include user engagement in the theory section which is another strand of research to be included. However, I personally think the paper works better without that when only focusing on the communicator perspective as you announce in the abstract. At the moment – with user engagement included – the paper wants a bit too much, I think. User engagement is another question that can and should be addressed in another paper.

**Marie-Eve – general feedback:**

Anyway, to dig right into the paper, I really appreciate the amount of work and effort put into the data collection and the design of the research. For me, you present an inventive and robust way to analyse and compare your sample with other “slices” of tweets. The fact that you use another political actor as well as random tweets reinforces your demonstration in my opinion. I also very much enjoy reading, it is well presented and easy to follow. Your graphs are clear and perfectly illustrate the variation you are discussing, so well done. Overall, I think it’s a very promising topic and a good angle to look at it. I think with the data that you have, you will be able to dig deeper into the discourse if you are so inclined.  
  
I just have a few thought that came to mind while reading your paper, feel free to ignore them of course (!), but I do think that we worked well together when we exchanged ideas and opened up new ways of looking at the material, so here goes nothing!

- Your introduction stresses politicization and then you lose this along the way before picking it up again a little “anecdotally” on page 11. I think you have quite a bit of material to exploit this line if you so decide (e.g. with very basic measure for “salience, polarization, mobilization”) or else, you might want to set it aside for now as it does not seem to be the core of what you are looking at here.

- Personal accounts: probably here you would expect personal account of supranational actors to display different levels of engagement. For example, executive actors with a lot of followers could use the platform more often, same as with elected actors (they are more personable), whereas agency actors are more difficult to even find because we are not familiar with their names (in Switzerland for example, official twitter handles are so counter-intuitive that they are hard to find and do not have much impact e.g. the federal health agency account: @BAG\_OFSP\_UFSP like…what?!!)

- Figure 4 (retweets and users mentions) just to highlight that I think this is incredibly interesting because these institutional actors theoretically work for the same overall goals and they use this tool of “echo chamber” to push their message in the same fashion that “trolls” on the platform would. I think that if you look more in depth into the data, you will find that they are in fact retweeting each other all the time, and very little outside of their network (that’s what I found anyway). In terms of communication strategy, this is interesting, but it also created somewhat of a closed system.

- For the issue of whether messages reach the audience: I think maybe you could look at the timestamp of the message to infer whether it has been seen by more or less users. Accounts with a clear strategy aiming at a largest impact probably publish at a certain time during the day where traffic is more intense. Just a thought. (sometimes on 9gag “Quick, upvote the metric system, the Americans are asleep”)

- Conclusion: has the number of followers grown at a higher rate than other actors on twitter? Because twitter has been growing a lot during this period anyway and maybe it’s unrelated to the EU actor itself but rather an effect of the network growth

- Also in key political questions: lag between discourse on twitter and policies adopted (in terms of accountability). Maybe this is outside of the scope of your research, but an interesting point nonetheless.