

Response to the Editors
*French Attitudes on Climate Change, Carbon
Taxation and other Climate Policies*

Thomas Douenne and Adrien Fabre*

September 16, 2019

Dear Editors,

We would like to thank you for giving us the opportunity to revise our paper. Your comments have stimulated us in implementing changes to the paper that we hope you will consider as significant improvements. Below we respond to each of your comments and to each of the reviewers' comments in detail. We replicate them (in italic) and add our reply item by item. We hope you will find our answers clear and satisfactory.

Kind regards,

Thomas Douenne & Adrien Fabre

I have received feedback from two reviewers, please see their comments below. The editors strongly support their arguments, including the lack of focus raised by Reviewer 1 and the call for a better review of the existing literature raised by Reviewer 2. In addressing their comments, I would kindly ask you to focus and not increase the length of the manuscript, as it already is a rather long – if not too long – manuscript including text, figures, tables and references.

In rewriting our manuscript, we ensured not to increase its length. The text now includes 7916 words against 7927 in the initial version. Following the

*Paris School of Economics. thomas.douenne@psemail.eu ; adrien.fabre@psemail.eu

suggestion of the second reviewer, we added two paragraphs to review the literature in introduction. However, we have greatly shortened section 3 (on attitudes over CC) as suggested by the first reviewer, which significantly decreased the manuscript size. The trimming of section 3 allowed to improve the focus of the paper on climate policies, even more so that we adopted a new narrative and now explain that section 3 is here to help understanding people's root motivations for accepting or rejecting climate policies. To further shorten our text, we also decided to remove section 5.2.4 on shale gas, as we think little new insights could be derived from it.

From an editorial perspective I would further like to add the following points:
1. Please carefully check your highlights. They include typos, grammar mistakes and are not expressed in good English language.

We are thankful for pointing out these grammar and spelling mistakes. We removed the unnecessary comma in the first highlight, which becomes *French people have limited knowledge about climate change but worry about it..* We corrected the grammar mistake in the second highlight (it is now *They prefer ... to* instead of *... than*). We improved the formulation of the fourth one (*Improving knowledge is predicted to increase ecological attitudes and concern.* instead of *... concern and ecological attitudes*). We also noticed that the fifth highlight could appear ambiguous: *Political leaning does not interact with knowledge to shape perceptions as in the US.* and reformulated it as *Unlike in the US, partisanship does not interact with education to shape perceptions..* We had the highlights double-checked by a native English speaker, but if some mistakes remain, we would be pleased to correct them. We also made sure that they respect the limit of 85 characters including spaces.

2. Please thoroughly check the whole manuscript regarding English language and precision of terms. For example, the last sentence of the abstract does not really make sense in relation to the topic of your paper: what do you mean by: "...could foster support for ecology."? Wrong translation? Your focus is climate policies, not ecology.

We had the whole manuscript double-checked by a native English speaker. However, some typos remained (e.g. *does not reflects* instead of *does not reflect*) and the terms chosen were sometimes imprecise (an academic kind of mistake that our native speaker could hardly notice). Thanks to your observations as well as those of the reviewers, we were able to correct typos and correct the terminology (see the responses to reviewers). For example, we replaced *foster support for ecology* by *foster support for climate policies*. After a thorough proof-reading of the last manuscript, we also spotted other English mistakes

(e.g. a missing plural, “its” instead of “their”, etc.). We now hope that there is no remaining mistake nor imprecision.

3. Your references section needs careful checking. Many references are incomplete, e.g., volumes and page numbers missing for journal papers.

We initially used a bibtex bibliographic style which does not display some required fields, like volumes and page numbers. We replaced it by a standard bibliographic style and all the references seem now complete.

4. Footnote 5 is strangely separated in two parts.

This unfortunate layout is now avoided.

5. Please carefully follow the journal’s guidelines for the resubmission of revised manuscripts, available online as part of the Guide for Authors.

We thank you for this reminder. With this revised form of the manuscript, please be reassured that we checked every item of the guide for author and that we now comply with all of them.