**Alerters, Critics, and Objectivists: Researchers in Austrian Newspaper Coverage of Climate Change**

*Responses to reviewers’ comments*

The three anonymous reviewers and the editor have provided very insightful and constructive comments on how to revise and, with that, considerably enhance our paper. We have carefully studied the comments and have tried to integrate them as effectively as possible. We hope that the revised version adequately addresses the raised points. In the following paragraphs, we will expound on the revisions made in our paper. Specifically, the comments led to substantial revisions of large parts of the paper, particularly in the chapters 1, 2, 3, and 5. The most important revisions can be summarized as follows:

*Chapter 1*

* Reviewer 1 (R1) noted a lack of clarity in the distinction between the terms “experts”, “researchers”, and “scientists”. We are very grateful for this comment because it helped us to strengthen the clarity of our paper. We added a footnote at the very beginning of chapter 1 explicitly pointing out that, in line with the scholarly literature, the terms “scientists”, “researchers”, and “scientific” in our paper refer to both natural and social science. Furthermore, we substituted the term “experts” through the more specific terms “scientists” or “researchers” to avoid confusion in the whole paper.
* Reviewer 2 (R2) and Reviewer 3 (R3) both asked us to more strongly emphasize the relevance of the Austrian case study. We draw on additional scholarly works to position our research in the literature on nationally specific media representations of scientific climate expertise and to point out that scholars have primarily considered a few paradigmatic lead countries, such as the US, the UK, and Germany. Through these revisions we were able to illustrate and stress the relevance of our research and the Austrian case.
* To further address the argumentative weakness and the lack of clarity regarding our research question noted by R1, we reformulated and specified the last paragraph in chapter 1. We now more clearly indicate that we aim at illustratively reconstructing and analyzing how researchers position themselves in Austrian print media.

*Chapter 2*

* The editor (E) and R3 suggested considering and integrating further conceptual works on the role of experts in policy-making, particularly on the role of epistemic communities. We thoroughly studied and integrated the suggested literature. We are most grateful for this advice because it helped us to more thoroughly embed and position our conceptual considerations in the State of the Art. We now more extensively elaborate on the role of epistemic communities and scientific consensus in policy-making and address the heterogeneity of scientific expertise due to different contexts and epistemic cultures at the beginning of chapter 2.
* To further stress the novelty of our study and to further emphasize the illustrative, reconstructive, and type-developing character of our study, we more explicitly expound the way our study goes beyond existing scholarly analyses of types of scientists in mass media at the end of chapter 2. We stress that we do not only identify and describe types of researchers in Austrian newspaper coverage of climate change but provide a more fine-grained analysis by refining and complementing analytical dimensions from existing scholarly works to demonstrate the researchers’ specific strategies and lines of argumentation.

*Chapter 3.1*

* We revised and complemented chapter 3.1 in addition to more strongly emphasizing the relevance of the Austrian case study in chapter 1 and 2. We now demonstrate that the Austrian media system is quite particular in Europe because it represents a prototype of a democratic-corporatist media system coming along with pronounced features.
* We more strongly illustrate the high importance of print media and especially newspapers for Austrian societal discourse to further strengthen the argumentation in favor of our case study in chapter 3.1. In doing so, we simultaneously address the demand of R2 to state why newspaper reporting in Austria is still relevant in times of new, social media. We illustrate that even in times of new, social media Austrian newspapers still exhibit a wide coverage and reach broad audiences and that newspapers even draw on the internet to broaden their coverage.

*Chapter 3.2*

* To address the demand of R1 we strengthened and substantiated our argumentation in favor of the year 2009 as period of analysis by drawing on literature that was suggested by R2.
* Against the background of remarks particularly made by R1 and R2, we complemented the information on the corpus of analyzed texts. First, we were able to substantiate our argumentation in favor of our selected text formats (i.e., interviews and guest commentaries) being suitable formats for noting researchers’ own positioning based on the scholarly literature recommended by R2. We now explicitly state that these text formats are narrative, opinion-oriented formats of journalistic presentation that enable researchers to articulate their own perspective more comprehensively than in other journalistic formats where journalists tend to more strongly edit researchers’ expertise. Second, we added more detailed information on the corpus of analyzed texts. We now provide information on the composition of interviews and guest commentaries and describe the distribution of analyzed texts across the different Austrian newspapers.
* R1, R2, and R3 asked us “to add more details how the qualitative analysis was applied”. Therefore, we substantially revised the information provided on our methodological approach. We particularly revised and complemented the paragraphs on the analytical dimensions, the coding process, and on developing the researcher types in chapter 3.2. First, we explain the process of deductively and inductively developing analytical dimensions and categories that eventually served as codes during our qualitative content analysis. We also present these deductive and inductive dimensions in chapter 3.1. Second, we describe more thoroughly how coding with deductively developed analytical dimensions from the scholarly literature resulted in the identification of the three types of researchers and, then, was tested, stabilized, and enriched by coding with the inductively developed categories. These revisions also, again, stress the illustrative, reconstructive character of our study that goes beyond existing scholarly works by providing a more fine-grained analysis refining and complementing analytical dimensions from the literature.

*Chapter 4*

* In addition to the footnote added in chapter 1, we aimed at addressing the demands of R1 to clarify the focus of our paper in chapter 4 as well. We now elaborate more in detail on researcher types’ composition of natural and social scientists at the beginning of chapter 4 before presenting the three types of researchers as well as at the beginning of each type’s description.

*Chapter 5*

* Against the background of the critique of R1, R2, and R3 we completely rewrote the discussions and conclusion in chapter 5 and considerably expanded the considered scholarly works. Particularly in this regard we are very grateful for the reviewers’ comments and the recommended scholarly literature because they helped us to considerably enhance the focus and clarity of our paper by more thoroughly expounding our arguments and distinguishing more clearly between empirical arguments from our case and scholarly findings (on other countries). Moreover, the revisions helped us to adequately position our research in the current State of the Art and in a broader international context. Thereby, we again aim at demonstrating and further emphasizing the relevance of the specific Austrian case study. First, we restructured the discussion section of chapter 5. We now (1) discuss the frequency of occurrence of types of researchers, then we address (2) the specific features of types of researchers, and afterward we discuss (3) whether there is a the tendency toward a politicization of climate science. Second, we additionally integrated the suggested scholarly literature in our discussion and now more extensively discuss our findings against the background of scholarly findings on other countries and on potential explanations for each aspect. Third, we rewrote our conclusions section of chapter 5. We now conclude by briefly reflecting on future research questions derived from our paper’s findings instead of focusing on our findings’ implications.

We hope that we were able to adequately address all critical and crucial issues that the three reviewers and the editor raised. Again, thank you for helping us to considerably enhance our paper!