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**Editor first decision – October 28, 2020 – Accept**

Dear Lilia Rissman,

I have now had a chance to read over your manuscript “Responding to the climate crisis: the importance of virtual conferencing post-pandemic”, along with the ported reviews and decision letter from another journal. I am happy to say I would like to accept your manuscript for publication in Collabra: Psychology, conditional on you responding to a few small points I raise below. I believe these points will be easy to address, and I look forward to accepting your manuscript when I receive your revision. Congratulations on this excellent work, I think it will make an important contribution to the literature and I look forward to seeing it published!

Please consider these points and submit a revised version of your manuscript, along with a cover letter describing your response to each point.

1. Please provide more information about potential biases in the sample. For example, could you provide a description of how the study was advertised, and discuss what effect this may have had in who was likely to participate? Please also consider other factors that may have impacted who is likely to have self-selected into this study (e.g., who had more time to complete the study, who was likely to perceive this study as important, etc.).
2. Please also discuss any potential for demand characteristics - is it possible that your materials could have conveyed to participants what types of answers you were hoping for? Relatedly, please discuss whether social desirability or other self-presentational concerns could have impacted people’s responses (in any direction).
3. Very minor point, but I would suggest changing “Previous criticisms of in-person conferencing were confirmed…” to “were echoed” - I think “confirmed” is too strong here, given the convenience sample, potential demand characteristics, etc.
4. Just before the figure, the sentence starting with “This change would increase scientific access” is a big ambiguous - “this change” could refer either to the lack of requirement to be physically present, or the reinstatement of that requirement (I know you mean the former, but I think it would be better to make that clearer).
5. Throughout the manuscript, you report means and t-values (along with degrees of freedom). First, I would like you to supplement the means with standard deviations (or some other measure of dispersion - if the distributions are skewed, you could use medians and interquartile range instead of means and standard deviations). Second, it seems a bit strange to me to report t-values and dfs, but not p-values. I don’t think p-values are necessary, either, I just wonder what the best combination of statistics is. Perhaps 95% confidence intervals would be better than t-values?

In summary, I think this is a strong manuscript and I look forward to receiving the final version.

Please ensure that your revised files adhere to our author guidelines, and that the files are fully copyedited/proofed prior to upload. Please also ensure that all copyright permissions have been obtained. This is the last opportunity for major editing, therefore please fully check your file prior to re-submission.

If you have any questions or difficulties during this process, please contact the editorial office at editorialoffice@collabra.org.

I hope your experiences with Collabra: Psychology have been positive and that you will continue to consider it as an outlet for your work.

Sincerely,

Simine Vazire Editor in Chief Collabra: Psychology

**Author response**

October 30, 2020

Collabra: Psychology

University of California Press

Dear Dr. Vazire:

Thank you for accepting our manuscript “Responding to the climate crisis: the importance of virtual conferencing post-pandemic.” We have copied your comments below and described how we have addressed them in the revised manuscript. We have attached a document with changes tracked as well as a clean document with all changes accepted. Please note that we have also made a typographical update to Figure 1 and have rearranged two sentences in the paragraph beginning “Previous criticisms of in-person conferencing…”

Thank you for your consideration of our manuscript and we look forward to seeing this work published in your journal! All authors have approved this submission.

Sincerely,

Dr. Lilia Rissman and Dr. Cassandra Jacobs

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

1) Please provide more information about potential biases in the sample. For example, could you provide a description of how the study was advertised, and discuss what effect this may have had in who was likely to participate? Please also consider other factors that may have impacted who is likely to have self-selected into this study (e.g., who had more time to complete the study, who was likely to perceive this study as important, etc.).

2) Please also discuss any potential for demand characteristics - is it possible that your materials could have conveyed to participants what types of answers you were hoping for? Relatedly, please discuss whether social desirability or other self-presentational concerns could have impacted people's responses (in any direction).

**To address these two points, we have added a footnote that states, “A representative recruitment message stated: “our lab ... is conducting a study on sustainability in cognitive science and we are interested in surveying researchers for a study about their habits and preferences for conference formats.” We acknowledge that participants who were already concerned about climate change may have been more likely to respond to this survey, and therefore the attitudes we report may not reflect the entire community. We also acknowledge that participants may have inferred that we the researchers believe sustainability is an important topic. Even if our sampling was biased in this way, we do not believe the phrasing of the questions from the survey biased participants toward particular responses.”**

3) Very minor point, but I would suggest changing "Previous criticisms of in-person conferencing were confirmed..." to "were echoed" - I think "confirmed" is too strong here, given the convenience sample, potential demand characteristics, etc.

**Thank you for this suggestion. This has been rephrased.**

4) Just before the figure, the sentence starting with "This change would increase scientific access" is a big ambiguous - "this change" could refer either to the lack of requirement to be physically present, or the reinstatement of that requirement (I know you mean the former, but I think it would be better to make that clearer).

**This has been changed.**

5) Throughout the manuscript, you report means and t-values (along with degrees of freedom). First, I would like you to supplement the means with standard deviations (or some other measure of dispersion - if the distributions are skewed, you could use medians and interquartile range instead of means and standard deviations). Second, it seems a bit strange to me to report t-values and dfs, but not p-values. I don't think p-values are necessary, either, I just wonder what the best combination of statistics is. Perhaps 95% confidence intervals would be better than t-values?

**We have elected to use confidence intervals to convey the variability in participant responses.**

**Editor final acceptance note**

October 30

Thank you Lilia, this is great.  I appreciate your responsiveness to my comments and your quick turnaround!