Underlying the Sustainable Development Goals is the imperative of spending to fulfill basic needs through limiting overuse of the natural commons, most importantly by limiting GHG emissions. In fact, many views on desirable global development converge on the need for redistribution from the richest in the world to funding provision of basic needs. The Global Climate Scheme, defined as a cap-and-trade-system on global emissions with proceeds obtained through auctioning and redistributed as a global basic income, is a representative policy instrument to achieve these purposes at once.

In economics and political science, two major reasons are identified why such an instrument is politically unrealistic: lack of global cooperation and inadequate institutions. First, from the Paris Agreement on Global Climate Change to [minimum corporate taxation in the G20], the outlook for harmonized global fiscal instruments is not promising. Second, credibly spending a basic income on the poorest globally is hampered by lack of access to them, risk of abuse of the funds through corruption and authoritarian regimes blocking activities from international institutions. It seems plausible that for this reason, globally redistributive policies could be unpopular in the Global North.

Surprisingly, social science has yet to analyse societal support for such global redistribution policy. In this manuscript we provide evidence that global redistribution, especially the GCS, is popular: half of US citizens and three quarters of citizens of major European countries support it. Specifically, our contribution is that this support is sincere and genuinely driven by universalistic values. We find, however, that concerns about transfers reaching the poorest people are real – citizens understand that transfers cannot be assumed to reach the poorest under present governance circumstances – perhaps more so than being concerned about lack of international Global North cooperation. Our approach is novel in confirming genuine support for global redistribution through testing for pluralistic ignorance, list experiments and a real-stake petition.

Our findings have implications for global policy-making: a focus on national institutions as the center of political decision-making or ignorance about specific proposals for global redistribution may impede sustainable development. [the Discission section is very worthwhile on that now]

Open points to me:

1. Is this more of a global redistribution or of a climate story? I think both are possible, but that we have a choice to make to present it coherently. The manuscript jumps around between them a bit currently.

=> I’d say global redistribution story, with a focus on the GCS to test the sincerity because it is the one that might not have majority support in the U.S.

(2) What’s the prior literature on similar \_surveys\_ doing? Not so much, at seems from A.1.1 [Carratini, Kallbekken, Orlov](https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-019-00124-x) is essentially what I knew before. We must somehow integrate a bit of A.1.1 – A1.4 into the main text.

=> You are right, I think we should cite two papers on the main text: the one you mention and Ghassim (2020). These are the only two previous relevant studies.

(3) Nature X have caps on “display items”, typically 6, probably more for the others. We would have to begin thinking which are the most important survey results. In fact, this might help guide the writing process.

=> Figures 1, 4 and Tables 1, 2 are the only ones that will remain in main text of published version.