

Major comments

Thank you for including a breakdown of the age, gender and profession of the IPCC scientists you interviewed. I think data on their nationality is also needed – maybe broken down by world region?

Many thanks for your comments. We are sorry but we did not include a question about nationality in our survey. Our point for not doing so is that IPCC rules are to be balanced in terms of nationalities of the scientific teams, and our research focus is mainly in the perspectives of the communication to the public of the IPCC findings.

I recommend including a copy of the full questionnaire, perhaps in an appendix. I think this is always good practice for any study about a survey. However, I think it is particularly important in your study, because you mention in the conclusion that some scientists had some concerns with parts of the questionnaire.

Many thanks for this suggestion. We did submit the questions and answers data, but we have also added a file with the full questionnaire.

Figure headings need to be clearer – it might work well if you use questions in the survey as your figure headings?

For example, figure 4b has the headline “What is the best way to communicate the contents of the IPCC to the general public?” This is a good headline, as it explains the responses.

However, figure 3a has a headline “The synthesis report”. This does not tell the reader what question the scientists are answering.

Many thanks for your points that help us to clarify our text. As you will see in the full questionnaire, this question was to place statements about the IPCC text. We have changed the first statement to clarify the answers.

Figure 2b has the heading "misinformation/biased information is a problem", with answers ranging from "very important" to "not important at all". Grammatically, the answers do not seem to match the question.

Many thanks for your comments. We think that in the context of the survey the, the phrases proposed are understandable and do not lead to misunderstanding on the answers.

Misinformation/biased information is a problem... Not important at all

Misinformation/biased information is a problem...Somewhat important

...

Misinformation/biased information is a problem...Very important

Minor comments

There are instances where the text of your article does not match the figures.

Line 141 refers to “misinformation and biased, self-interested information”, whereas the figure refers to “misinformation/biased information”.

Many thanks for your point. We have amended it in text.

Line 134 uses the words “alarmed” and “worried”, whereas the figure uses “alarmed” and “concerned”.

Many thanks for your point. We have amended it in text.

The findings from your study sometimes mix with your citations in a confusing way – for example in lines 191-200. For clarity, the text could be amended to make a clearer distinction between your work and other peoples' work

We have amended the text following your kind suggestion

In figure 3b, “Actions that could make IPCC reports easier to understand”, I am not sure what the “best knowledge possible” option means? My understanding is that the IPCC already uses the best body of scientific knowledge available. Please correct me if I am misunderstanding the question or answer, and/or clarify the text to make it clearer.

Many thanks for your comment. The literal text of the proposed answer is: They must concentrate on embodying scientific knowledge on each subject (the question is: 7 IPCC reports tend to be quite technical and extensive, and not always easy to understand. What are the features that can facilitate comprehension to people outside the field of science, or with less training?)

We have changed the text of the figure to **Embodying scientific knowledge**

I don't understand the conclusion drawn in lines 213-216. Are you arguing that the lack of engagement by the IPCC linked to the fact that the average reader has difficulty understanding the reports.

This is exactly our conclusion!

In fact this paper is part of one of the authors Phd about “Climate change communication: actions and strategies to increase public awareness and improve decision-making” that will be defended in the third week of January 2025.

Do you have any recommendations for the experts working on AR7 based? I would be interested to hear them - maybe in a discussion section?

Surely we have!

As a result of our research, and in form of a corollary of the Phd, we presented a communication at the EMS conference in Barcelona

<https://meetingorganizer.copernicus.org/EMS2024/EMS2024-211.html>

This research has been sent to be published as a letter to the editor.