				Collaborator Prioritization & Comments				Outcome Variable Groups Involved			
#	RQ - Research Question	Hypotheses	Analysis Ideas	Question Priority (MB)	Reasoning, Comments, Questions (MB)	Question Priority (BC)	Reasoning, Comments, Questions (BC)	Awareness	Casualty Causes	Support Reactions	Decision Factors
1	How 'aware' is the general UK & US public of nuclear winter as a potential consequence of nuclear weapons use?	H1: Awareness of NW is low across the general UK & US populaces. H2: Awareness of the 1980s debates is higher among older than among younger respondents.	Descriptive analysis: numbers & percentages of respondents in each awareness level (a) within each awareness source category (1980s, recent academic, recent media) via simple histograms, and (b) across categories via converting awareness levels to numeric and taking an average. Pairwise correlations, factor analysis & cronbach's alpha - measure consistency between responses to awareness source categories.	1	Needs to be the first output in any paper, as readers will expect descriptive data to be summarised. Probably include a big table with all descriptive data, so readers can look up what variables were covered, their mean, median, SD, range etc.			X			
2	How well does awareness of nuclear winter correlate with support for nuclear retaliation?	H1: Higher reported awareness of nuclear winter will correlate with lower support for nuclear retaliation.	Note: this effect will only be observable in the treatment group as only they were asked to report their awareness.	1	Important as it gets to whether the source matters (infographic vs recent research vs 1980s memory)			X		X	
3	To what degree does showing respondents the infographic about nuclear winter (i.e. 'informing' them) correspond with significant changes in levels of support for different government responses, with special focus on nuclear retaliation?	H1a: Participants shown the infographic will have lower support for nuclear retaliation H1b: Participants shown the infographic will have higher support for non-escalatory responses (sanctions, ceasefire)		1	Yes, I think this is the core of the paper					X	
4	How do the patterns of decision factors judged as important change along the increasing/decreasing levels of support for nuclear retaliation?			1	Yes, important, nice to know WHY the public thinks what they do					X	X
5	To what degree do respondents' estimations of the number of casualties from blast, radiation, and starvation correlate with specialist/expert estimates? What patterns of (dis)agreement with experts do we see across different demographic groups?	Due to low levels of awareness of nuclear winter, respondents will tend to rank blast and radiation as causing more casualties than starvation.	Pairwise correlations, factor analysis & cronbach's alpha - measure consistency between responses to casualty source categories.	2	Less important than some other analyses for me, since main concern is whether people are aware of nuclear winter and its general effects, rather than whether non-specialists can get proportions of deaths right.				X		
6	Which demographic factors correlate with support for nuclear retaliation?			2	subsidiary to above					X	
7	How do levels of expected casualties mediate the relationship between infographic exposure and policy support, if at all?	H2a (some sort of mediation analysis): Infographic → increased awareness → decreased support for nuclear retaliation H2b (similarly mediation analysis): Infographic → higher starvation casualty estimates → decreased support for escalation	Descriptive: Use factor score, K-means or hierarchical clustering to find main profiles of expected casualties. Then visualize as angle-based triangle (vertices placed on circles corresponding to expected number of casualties, like a spider graph) Numeric Transformations: Assign to each category a numeric midpoint in millions or log10 scale, then use for mediation. Could be split out by casualty cause for three mediators or aggregate (sum, extract first principle component) to provide single mediator (total expected casualties). Categorical Rank Pattern: For example, imagine the three casualty causes as the vertices of a triangle with three possible relationships between each: more, equal, or fewer expected casualties. Generated pairwise ordinal 'relationship' variables could be used to develop profiles of the main 'mental models' of nuclear war. Pairwise Comparisons: compute differences between numerically transformed ordinal scales (e.g. starvation - blast, starvation - radiation). Then insert as mediator into regressions to inform whether, say, exposure to the infographic seems to have flipped the sign.	2	Subsidiary to above, could be explored in some detail IF there is a positive association above, less important if do not find clear higher level findings. Could end up in a supplementary file just mentioned in the main paper				X	X	
8	Which decision factors most strongly predict support for different response types?	H3: "Avoid escalation" and "Avoid civilian deaths/famine" will negatively predict support for nuclear strikes		2	As above, depends on main findings					X	X
9	To what degree does showing respondents the infographic about nuclear winter (i.e. 'informing' them) correlate with significant changes in the factors reported as influencing their decisions to support the various government reactions in the provided scenarios?			2	ie delta between controls and cases. Dependent on main findings.					X	X
10	To which key research questions regarding nuclear winter could future general public surveys best empirically contribute?		What questions might we include that would help us make direct comparisons with similar surveys regarding awareness of climate change? E.g. imitate climate change survey that measures things like 'trust in science' so that we can directly compare nuclear winter and climate change, What else can we learn by measuring not only awareness, but also (a) depth of knowledge, and (b) agreement of alignment of nuclear posture/doctrine with potential risks.	3	Leave this for once we've written up the results and discussion						