

## S1 Text. Details of jury recruitment

The participants were representative of the UK population based on gender, age, ethnicity, and disability status. It was more difficult to match national statistics for the remaining selection criteria. For educational attainment, no respondents had no education and very few had only level one qualifications. To offset this, we over-recruited those whose highest qualifications were level 2 (23.3% of sample vs 13.4% nationally). However, people with level four qualifications were still overrepresented (47% of sample vs 34 % nationally). No respondents to the survey reported being 'not at all concerned' about climate change. We attempted to over-recruit those who were 'not very' concerned, though one dropped out before the start of the process. We therefore could only offset the lack of 'not at all concerned' participants by under-recruiting 'very concerned' participants (47% in sample vs 52% nationally). The gap was made up by 'fairly concerned' respondents. Though we were originally able to match political affiliations well, a number of Conservative supporters chose not to take part once contacted, and so the final sample slightly over-represented Labour supporters (30% in sample vs 24% nationally). Given the small size of the sample, and the number of criteria we were recruiting against, the final sample fits within industry standards for a broadly representative sample in this type of process. The main weakness in the sample resulted from the lack of rural respondents. As we got no responses, all participants lived in urban postcodes. This could potentially bias the results, and should be considered in the interpretation of the findings.