

Dear editor, dear reviewers,

we are glad that you accept our revision and only point out minor issues. We are very grateful that you treated our submission so fast: this will notably allow for a timely contribution about the Yellow Vests. We are also sincerely thankful for all of your comments, which helped us improve significantly the outline of the paper and its overall quality. Apart from your new comments that we integrated systematically, we would like to notify that we added an additional reference regarding preferred revenue recycling, Beiser-McGrath & Bernauer (2019), at the end of section 5.1.2.

Kind regards,

Thomas Douenne & Adrien Fabre

Reviewer 1

I welcome the revisions done by the authors and I believe the manuscript is almost ready for publication. I only have a few minor issues.

1) I find the subheadings and figure captions in section 3 a bit confusing. Fig. 2-5 belong to 3.1 “Knowledge”, but their captions talk about “perceived” causes, factors, etc. Then you have a subsection 3.2 called “Perceptions”. Please make sure that you use these concepts in ‘correct’ way, for example by consulting the literature about climate change knowledge which I cited in my first referee report.

Relatedly, the entire section seems to be more about knowledge and perceptions than about “Attitudes” related to climate change. Perhaps change the heading of this section?

- To remove the confusion between “perceived” in captions related to the *Knowledge* subsection and the *Perceptions* subsection, we relabeled the latter *Positions*. It makes sense to talk of “positions” as the results concern the responsible for CC and the perceived impacts, both of which reflect a judgment of the situation in addition to a mere perception of reality. We also changed the heading of this section to *Perceptions and Attitudes over Climate Change*.

2) “GhG” should be “GHG”.

- Done.

3) I’m not sure what you want to say in your final sentence of the conclusions? What is meant with “former”? Are you suggesting that one first needs a combination of policies in order to arrive at a single price signal? Maybe think about making this clearer.

- To avoid the ambiguity, we now abstain from using *former* or *latter* and the last sentence instead reads: “The French context seems to call for a focus on the other policies to make the carbon tax politically acceptable.”

4) Your references are not ordered alphabetically by last name?

- Our references are already ordered alphabetically by last name, even though the first names appear before the last names. We believe from past experience that the publisher uses their own bibliographic style at the end of the publication process. Thus, as we provided a complete bibliography (.bib), we expect that the style of references will be consistent with the journal upon publication.

Reviewer 2

Dear authors,

I am very satisfied with the revisions and just found some very minor points which need to be fixed before publication:

* In line 16 of the introduction it says "...knowledge about change change (CC)...". Should be "climate change".

- Done. Thank you for pointing out this embarrassing typo at the beginning of the paper.

* On line 68: "...driving people's preferences...". Should be "peoples' ".

- It seems that you suggest that we should use *peoples* instead of the other plural form *people** to denote the fact that we report results from different countries. However, the paper that we cite in the same sentence (de Groot & Schuitema, 2012) only concerns the UK, so it seems to us more natural to keep *people*. This choice has also been confirmed by a native American speaker.

*(see <https://www.grammarly.com/blog/persons-people-peoples/>)

* Conclusion, line 700: "...coincidence either if the 1991 Swedish tax...". Should this be: "...coincidence either **that** the 1991 Swedish tax..." ?

- Thank you. We corrected this grammar mistake accordingly.