Dear Editor,

We thank you very much for both reviewers providing detailed, insightful critique of our manuscript.

Please find the responses to each reviewer’s points below. The line numbers referenced below are corresponding to those mentioned by the reviewers.

Reviewer 1:

**Basic Reporting**

*Minor Corrections*

1. We have now included a reference to Figure 1 in the text.
2. We have amended the number on line 224 to 0.5
3. We have amended the number on line 225 to 0.9
4. We now reference Figure 4 when referring to the histograms in in 366 and 367
5. We have amended the number on line 481 to 381
6. We have amended ‘redaction’ to ‘reduction’
7. We have amended Figure 1’s original sample size to 1035

*Quality of the work*

1. We have now rotated Figure 2 and 3 by 90 degrees to make viewing easier. We have retained lines 162 to 174 as they correspond to coding in the original dataset that we feel is important if someone wanted to use it.
2. We have now included raw text scripts on the OSF in addition to our PDF script.

Reviewer 2 (Marius Raab) :

**Basic Reporting**

1. We have gone into more detail in our introduction (see tracked text) by including recent contributions from the field relating to conspiracy ideation and belief (including Uscinski and Goertzl).
2. See **Validity**
3. We have now edited our abstract to remove any insinuation on line 24 that we are covering the mechanisms of belief formation in our paper.

**Validity of the findings**

1. We have now referred back to Haidt in our discussion that relates their previous reliability scores of morality to our test-retest reliability scores. We suggest that morality is relatively unstable in our paper due to the fluctuations of current events on the moral beliefs and values of an individual.
2. The reviewer suggested that we use “Hostility” as a new name for our moral theme in the BVI. While this is very reasonable given the reduced measure, we conclude in our findings that it is better to use all 10 morality questions in the assessment of one’s moral beliefs. Therefore, as questions extend past the beliefs about enacting harm and go toward conventional moral belief, we have kept our theme name as ‘Morality’.

Once again, we thank the reviewers for their useful and constructive comments in the edits to this manuscript and hope that our changes meet their requirements.

Yours sincerely,

Joe Barnby