Thank you for the additional suggestions, and your endorsement of our manuscript. We will incorporate your suggestions in a second revised version, but would prefer to wait until Reviewer 2 has replied before doing so. Our responses to your second review:

On #Figure1:

Sorry for the confusion, "citations" was an error, I meant "publications".

If possible, it would be great to show that there is no difference for e.g. a threshold of 50 or 150. What I meant by average rate was at least N publications per year. I don't know whether this would make a difference to your analysis.

**Response**: Our revised analysis used a more relaxed threshold of 100 publications on climate change topics throughout the time period. Our analysis is robust to different ‘total’ thresholds, but we feel that including a sensitivity analysis in this short comment piece would be excessive. A threshold based on publication rates (i.e. N publications per year) would exclude many new journals, and journals that have only recently focused on climate change research.

Page 2/L 40:

Might "social media metrics" better be replaced with "media metrics", since policy reports and news outlets are also included in Altmetrics?

**Response**: Yes, that would be more appropriate, thank you.

Page 3/L 66:

"Pirated" is a loaded term, it might be more appropriate to describe it more neutrally and descriptive, see e.g. the Abstract of Himmelstein et al.

**Response**: Thank you, we will change to ‘*open access publication respository*’.

Page 3/L 67:  
The Sci-Hub domains keeps changing or being shut down so it might be better to reference something else, maybe just the Wikipedia page.

**Response**: Great suggestion, changed to https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sci-Hub.

Page 6/L 121:

Open Science definitions include often much more, e.g. open peer review, open grant writing, open evaluation, open notebook science, so it might be clearer to state that these are "core principles" or something similar.

**Response**: Good point. Changed to ‘*Core OS principles’*.

Page 6/L 124

The specificness to climate change research wasn't clear to me here. I believe what is meant is, that climate change research benefits especially from these factors (due to the reasons given earlier).

**Response**: We will rearrange this sentence to place emphasis on climate change benefiting from OS, as discussed.