A cross-platform analysis of polarization and echo chambers in climate change discussions

Aleix Bassolas,¹ Joan Massachs,^{2, 1} Emanuele Cozzo,^{2, 3} and Julian Vicens¹

¹Eurecat, Centre Tecnològic de Catalunya, Barcelona, Spain

²Departament de Física de la Matèria Condensada and Institute of Complex Systems (UBICS),

Universitat de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

³CNSC-IN3 Universitat Oberta de Catalunya, Barcelona, Spain

With the intensification of climate change discussion, social media has become prominent in disseminating reliable and unreliable content. In this study, we present a cross-platform analysis on Youtube and Twitter, and examine the polarization and echo chambers in social media discussions in four datasets related to climate change: COP27, IPCC, Climate Refugees, and Doñana. We have identified communities of users spreading misinformation on Twitter, although they remain relatively isolated from the rest of the network. The analysis by interaction type reveals that climate change sceptics use mentions to draw the attention of other communities. The YouTube posts referenced on Twitter reveal a strong correlation in the community organisation of social media, suggesting a platform alignment. Moreover, we report the presence of echo chambers in YouTube post-sharing related to mainstream and sceptical content.

While a certain level of societal conflict can benefit democracies, an excessively polarized social environment can detrimentally affect their self-governing capacity [1], especially when it pertains to issues that require a high level of consensus to be addressed. The convolution of a highly polarized social environment and an overload of fast-spreading controversial or unreliable information impacts public perception of reality [2]. This dynamic, exacerbated during emergencies and crises [3, 4], further complicates the quest for solutions, rendering resolution increasingly challenging.

A social system is considered to be maximally polarized when the population is divided into two groups of similar size with diametrically opposed views that remain almost isolated [5, 6]. Studies and experiments across various platforms [7–9] have shown an increase in polarization attributed to the use of social media. However, the precise impact of online social networks on public debate remains ambiguous [10]. Evidence might vary across topics of discussion and online platforms. While Twitter tends to display high polarization, other platforms, such as WhatsApp, have even shown de-polarization [11]. The analysis of Twitter debates across different topics [12] revealed that the discussion on Obamacare was far less polarized than the debate on abortion. Other platforms such as YouTube or Instagram also display polarization [13–16] Additionally, external events have been observed to heighten activity and polarization on social media platforms [17–19].

Even though the interest in measuring social and political polarization dates from before the digital era [6, 20], the widespread of online social platforms and data accessibility sparked the development of measures to quantify it. There are two main categories of polarization metrics, along with combinations of them, employed in the analysis of digital traces within online social platforms: those centred on textual analysis [21], and those focusing on interactions and network structure [22].

The first metrics developed to quantify the macroscopic level of structural polarization primarily concentrate on the modularity and the analysis of community boundaries [22–24]. However, these metrics only provide a partial perspective on polarization, as they largely disregard the multi-scalar organisation of networks and the role of individual nodes. More refined metrics, which capture long-range structural properties, include label propagation [25], centrality measures, and random walk diffusion [26]. Recent studies have aimed to integrate the analysis of structural polarization

with individual opinions [12]. Even though most of the measures assume a dipole organisation, there have been recent developments to quantify multipole polarization [27].

Several studies indicate that a phenomenon closely intertwined with the rise of polarization in social media is the prevalence of echo chambers [28–30], where interactions predominantly occur among individuals who share similar beliefs and ideas. Research exploring the existence and strength of echo chambers across various social media platforms has revealed a spectrum of prevalence and intensity [7, 14, 29, 31–33]. Notably, platforms like Facebook and Twitter exhibit more pronounced echo chambers compared to Gab and Reddit. The presence of echo chambers can be quantified through the political leaning of an individual and its neighbourhood [34]. As interest in modelling the dynamics of polarization and echo chambers grows [35, 36], efforts to discern the multiple factors influencing social media interaction patterns face significant challenges. Even the recommendation algorithms employed by these platforms can impact observed dynamics [37–39]. For instance, platforms may inadvertently exacerbate polarization by limiting exposure to opposing viewpoints in users' feeds [8].

The combination of a polarized environment [40] and psychological traits [41], such as confirmation bias [42–44], has been closely associated with the dissemination of misinformation [45]. This spread of unreliable and fake news significantly impacts society, influencing outcomes such as presidential elections [46, 47] and vaccine hesitancy [48, 49]. Despite these challenges, there have been concerted efforts to combat the spread of fake news [50]. Nonetheless, debates persist regarding the distinction between reliable and unreliable news cascades. Although initial studies highlighted structural differences [51], subsequent analyses have suggested that disparities may be more attributable to differences in cascade size [52].

Besides politics, climate change stands out among the topics in which unreliable news has proliferated [53, 54]. The existence of climate change has been proven repeatedly from a scientific perspective [55–58] as has its anthropogenic contribution [59–61]. There are multiple pieces of evidence on the impact of climate change on health [62], the economy [63], the agriculture [64] or the overall ecological system [65], among others. However, there has been an increasing polarization in social media around the impact of climate change and its anthropogenic nature [66]. Previous research has focused on the origins of this polarization [67], its relation to political affiliations [68], and the influential roles played by media outlets [69] and corporations [70]. Recently, an increasing polarization was reported in locations suffering from extreme weather events [71].

In this work, we analyse the climate change discussion in four datasets from Twitter and YouTube across different contexts. The degree of polarization varies across datasets due to their distinct characteristics and is higher in the Doñana dataset, possibly due to its close relation with local politics. We analysed the interaction between the two largest communities spreading reliable and unreliable content and confirmed a weak interaction between them. Additionally, we provide a cross-platform perspective by examining YouTube links shared on Twitter (currently X) and analysing the bipartite graph derived from these links. Our findings reveal a connection between communities across both platforms, indicating a strong interconnection across social media platforms.

I. DATA DESCRIPTION

We extracted four datasets related to climate change topics from Twitter through the Twitter Academic API. The first one is related to the 2022 United Nations Climate Change Conference (COP27), the second to the release of the 6th Assessment Report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the third to the climate refugee crisis resulting from extreme weather conditions (Climate Refugees), and the fourth to a new legislation concerning the natural reserve

Network	Minimum date	Maximum date	Number of users	Tweets	Retweets	Replies	Quotes
COP27	2022-09-01	2022-11-27	1351903	866753	4977874	205973	175078
IPCC	2023-03-18	2023-03-26	157056	31138	267971	45863	7751
Clim. Refugees	2008-03-10	2022-12-31	841454	384267	1376057	139699	38909
Doñana	2019-01-01	2023-04-30	290782	139478	1187646	135245	25056

TABLE I. Summary table of the Twitter datasets analysed. Minimum and maximum dates, observed number of users, and number of tweets by typology.

Network	Videos	Min. Date	Max. Date	Avg. views	Avg. likes	Avg. comments
COP27	624	2008-02-11	2023-05-12	571964.35	5860.32	306.99
IPCC	145	2007-11-03	2023-06-09	350178.66	8991.67	1455.16
Clim. Refugees	215	2009-11-22	2023-11-06	243720.27	3604.81	527.40
Doñana	191	2009-01-11	2023-06-01	101098.32	3622.68	246.25

TABLE II. Summary table of the Youtube datasets analysed. Number of videos in each community, minimum and maximum dates observed, and average number of views, likes, and comments.

of Doñana in the south of Spain (Doñana). The tweet recollection was conducted with Twarc [72] by searching for keywords related to each discussion (Appendix A).

In Table I we present the main statistics of the datasets and in Fig. S1 the daily tweet activity, where the Climate Refugees and Doñana datasets exhibit longer timespans than the IPCC and COP27 datasets. The IPCC dataset covers only nine days, coinciding with the heightened discussion surrounding the release of the 6th Assessment Report. We provide in Appendix B the most central users based on the total inflow of retweets (Tables S1, S2, S3, and S4) and the most frequent languages in the ten largest communities of each dataset (Tables S5, S6, S7, and S8).

We extracted the corresponding YouTube dataset by analysing the URLs referenced in each Twitter dataset and downloading the posts and comments using the YouTube Data API. To ensure relevance, we filtered the posts by searching for occurrences of certain keywords in each video title or description (Appendix A).

We present a summary of the YouTube datasets in Table II, which includes the number of videos, the minimum and maximum dates, and their average statistics. Unlike the Twitter dataset, the period of the comments is longer due to users frequently referencing older videos. Fig. S2 illustrates the time series of comments in each dataset. Each dataset exhibits peaks at different times based on its unique characteristics. In particular, we observe a strong alignment in the IPCC and COP27 datasets with the event dates.

II. TWITTER ANALYSIS

We evaluated the global polarization on Twitter by considering the unweighted network of retweets where links are undirected and indicate a retweet interaction between two users. We used the Metis partition algorithm [73] to split the graph into two clusters, and we calculated the modularity [74, 75], the E-I index [76] and the adaptive E-I index [77] which accounts for the uneven size of clusters. The results for the four datasets analysed are presented in Fig. 1. Following the methodology proposed in [22], we computed polarization metrics in the observed network $\Phi(G)$, as well as in the ensemble of configuration models with equivalent degree distribution $\Phi(G_{CM})$ [78], and calculated the denoised value $\hat{\Phi}(G) = \Phi(G) - \Phi(G_{CM})$.



FIG. 1. **Polarization in the Twitter dataset.** Quantification of the polarization in Twitter: (a) modularity, (b) E-I index, and (c) adaptive E-I index. We provide the measures for the observed networks in red, across 100 realizations of the configuration model with preserved degree sequences in blue, and the difference between them (denoised value) in yellow.

All networks exhibit polarization according to the denoised value. In particular, the COP27 and Doñana datasets displayed larger denoised values, suggesting a stronger polarization around the topics. The higher polarization observed in the COP27 dataset may be attributed to the presence of communities using different languages that do not interact with each other (Table S5). The Doñana dataset captures the discussion around a new law related to natural park preservation, which involves political parties and users with strong political affiliations. The lower polarization observed in the IPCC dataset may be due to its nature as a scientific report release rather than an international conference, potentially attracting a more scientifically educated audience and inducing a lower level of polarization. The standardised values [22] (Fig. S3) indicate that polarization is stronger in the Climate Refugees dataset.

We examine the network of retweets and mentions between the 10 largest communities of the networks in Fig. 2. We identified these communities using modularity optimisation on the directed weighted graph of retweets [75]. The interaction patterns between the largest community (labelled as 0) and the remaining communities vary across datasets and types of interactions. In the IPCC and COP27 networks, the smaller communities mostly retweet content from the largest community, which is more isolated and engages in fewer interactions with the rest of the network. Those largest communities feature official accounts such as the Secretary General of the United Nations or the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (Tables S1 and S2). Conversely, the Doñana network exhibits greater flow heterogeneity between communities, with community 5 playing a central role in attracting most of the flow. The detailed overview of the users in the community reveals the presence of the president of Spain and the ruling political party (Table S4). There are significant structural differences depending on the type of interaction. For instance, in the IPCC network, there are relatively few retweets from community 1 to community 0, but there is a high volume of mentions.

To assess the political bias and reliability of each community, we calculated the user values by averaging over the URLS they shared. Information on the political bias and reliability of news outlets was obtained from MediaBias fact-check [79], where positive and negative political



FIG. 2. Community interaction network. Interaction between the ten largest communities in (a) COP27, (b) IPCC, (c) Climate Refugees, (d) Doñana. Arrows indicate the direction of the interaction, the colour and width, and the volume. The size of the dots represents community size. In red, we show the interaction through retweets and, in blue, through mentions.

bias correspond to right-wing and left-wing media, respectively. Outlets with higher reliability are considered more trustworthy and tend to share more verified news. For the Doñana dataset, the reliability and bias were based on a separate dataset [80], given that most media sources are Spanish. To facilitate the analysis, we have normalised the bias within the range [-1, 1] and the reliability within the range [0, 1]. The minimum and maximum bias are set according to the largest absolute value observed. In Fig. 3(a)-(d), we show the density plot of community reliability as a function of their political bias according to the shared URLs in the IPCC, COP27, Climate Refugees, and Doñana networks. We computed user-level values by averaging over the sources they shared, and then calculated community-level values by averaging over the users. All datasets have a left bias as most communities display negative values, particularly pronounced in the IPCC and Climate Refugee networks. Possible reasons for this include bias in the source data, climate change sceptics sharing non-official sources, or an over-representation of left-biased users in climate change discussions. Left-wing users might interact more in the context of climate change due to their higher awareness. The left bias is particularly pronounced in the IPCC and Climate Refugee networks, where the cluster of large communities is centred around negative values. However, the bias is more dispersed in the Doñana dataset, possibly due to differences in the shared media sources or a wider ideological variety. We show the user distributions of bias and reliability for the seven largest communities in Fig. 3(e)-(h) with most of them peaked at negative values (left bias). The main communities with right bias we have identified are community one in the COP27 and IPCC, community six in Climate Refugees, and community zero in Doñana.



FIG. 3. Reliability as a function of the political bias in the networks studied. (a-d) Density plot of the distribution of reliability as a function of the bias for the communities detected in (a) COP27, (b) IPCC, (c) Climate Refugees and (d) Doñana. (e-h) Distribution of bias and reliability in the seven largest communities for (e) COP27, (f) IPCC, (g) Climate Refugees and (h) Doñana.

Based on the previous findings and manual inspection of the communities (See Tables S1, S2, S3, and S4), we identified the two largest communities with opposing political leanings. In the IPCC and COP27 datasets, community 0 represents the largest community aligned with the mainstream climate change narrative, while community 1 is the primary advocate of a counter-narrative message. However, in the Doñana network, the labels are swapped because the right-biased community has a larger user base. For the Climate Refugees dataset, most of the top 10 communities exhibit similar bias-reliability values, except for community 6, which stands out with low reliability and a right bias. In this dataset, we designate community 1 as the primary left-biased community, as it includes well-known influencers such as Greta Thunberg and engages in more interactions with the sceptic community.

To evaluate the isolation of the communities, we calculated the directed interactions between them, and we computed the normalised outflow difference given by

$$P_i^{out} = \frac{\sum_{j,j \neq i} T_{ij} - T_{ii}}{\sum_{\forall j} T_{ij}},\tag{1}$$

and the entropy of flows as

$$H_i^{out} = -\sum_{\forall j} p_{ij} log p_{ij},\tag{2}$$

where T_{ij} is the number of interactions from community *i* to community *j* and p_{ij} is the probability of having a retweet from *i* to *j* given by $T_{ij} / \sum_{\forall j} T_{ij}$. While the first index quantifies the ratio between external and internal links and goes from -1 to 1 when all flows are external, the entropy provides information on the variety of those flows. The entropy is 0 when there is no variety of flows and 1 when it is maximum.

In Fig. 4, we represent the outflow entropy as a function of the isolation for the four networks. Most of the largest communities exhibit a certain degree of isolation, indicated by negative values. Across all datasets, the right-biased community demonstrates strong isolation and low entropy, implying their messages have limited spread across the network. However, the pattern changes when considering the mention graph (Fig. S4). The largest mainstream communities show minimal mentions of other communities, whereas the low-reliability communities display lower isolation and more external mentions. This observation suggests that climate change sceptics may reference the mainstream community to attract attention but get little attention instead.

We computed the minimum and maximum attainable entropy values as a function of P_i^{out} and p_{ii} for orientation. Given a value of P_i^{out} we have

$$\frac{\sum_{j,j\neq i} T_{ij}}{\sum_{\forall j} T_{ji}} = P_i + \frac{T_{ii}}{\sum_{\forall j} T_{ij}} = P_i + p_{ii}.$$
(3)

The minimum value of the entropy corresponds to the situation when a community is connected only to itself and one external community (except for the extreme case $P_i = 1$), which we can plug into the entropy as

$$H_i^{in} = -p_{ii}logp_{ii} - P_i + p_{ii}logP_i + p_{ii}.$$
(4)

The maximum value of the entropy appears when a community is linked to all the others with a flow $T_{ij}/(N_c - 1)$, where N_c is the total number of communities in the network. Thus, it can be written as

$$H_i^{in} = -p_{ii} log p_{ii} - \sum_{j=0}^{N_c - 1} \frac{P_i + p_{ii}}{N_c - 1} log \frac{P_i + p_{ii}}{N_c - 1}.$$
(5)

In Fig. S5, we present the reversed quantities computed for the inflow, where we also observe that the right-biased communities with low reliability are among the most isolated.

Given that many networks include users from different countries speaking various languages, we also calculated polarization by focusing on the two largest communities speaking the same language with opposing biases, comparing the networks of retweets and mentions (Fig. S6). They still exhibit polarization in the retweet network, however, the scores are considerably smaller or



FIG. 4. Community connectivity and entropy in retweet networks. Outflow entropy as a function of the normalised outgoing isolation in the retweet networks of (a) COP27, (b) IPCC, (c) Climate Refugees, and (d) Doñana. The grey area corresponds to the range of feasible values.

even negative in the mention network. Thus, we confirm the previous findings on the disparity in network organization based on interaction typology. Our results suggest that focusing solely on retweet networks may provide a biased perspective on Twitter dynamics and that effective polarization, in terms of interaction between opposing views, may be low.

A. User analysis

Throughout this section, we assess the presence of echo chambers with a focus on the two largest communities exhibiting opposing political biases. We employed an approach developed in [31] to evaluate the existence of echo chambers. For a given user *i* with degree k_i , we computed its average bias x_i and reliability y_i , along with the average bias and reliability of its neighbourhood, denoted as $\frac{1}{k_i} \sum_{\forall j \neq i} A_{ij} x_j$ and $\frac{1}{k_i} \sum_{\forall j \neq i} A_{ij} y_j$, respectively.

In Fig. 5, we show the density plot for the bias of the neighbourhood of users as a function of their own values when considering the interactions through retweets. As expected from the overall ideological positioning of the users, there is a hotspot on the left of the ideological spectrum and a weaker one on the right side. We have identified a diagonal trend that could be related to the presence of echo chambers. Right-biased users interact more with left-biased users, as there are two hotspots for positive values in some cases. The presence of echo chambers is more evident in the



FIG. 5. Detection of bias echo chambers in the retweet networks. Neighbourhood political bias as a function of the user bias in the retweet network for (a) COP27, (b) IPCC, (c) Climate Refugees, and (d) Doñana.

Doñana dataset than in the rest of the networks, mainly due to the presence of more users with right bias. There are three hotspots of comparable magnitude across the diagonal with right, centre, and left bias. Still, the hotspot on the left side of the spectrum displays a lower ideological isolation, since it interacts with users featuring a bias close to 0. The right-biased users interact mainly between themselves and not with users in the centre. When analysing other types of interactions, such as the mentions (Fig. S7), the presence of echo chambers is weaker with nearly horizontal hotspots in the COP27 and IPCC datasets. This observation is consistent with the results on polarization from the previous section. The existence of echo chambers is less pronounced when considering different types of interactions, and mentions could serve as a bridge between users with different political biases.

We also examine the echo chambers of the content reliability in Fig. S8, where there are three hotspots for high, medium, and small values. The reliability has a similar behaviour, the hotspots in high reliability suggest that users who share highly reliable sources interact with each other, while low-reliability users interact with users that spread highly reliable sources.

We inspect in detail the user interaction similarity by quantifying their echo chamber [81], without considering the ideology. Given a set of leading users i, which have an audience A_i composed of



FIG. 6. Chamber overlap distribution q_{ij} . Chamber overlap distribution for (a) COP27, (b) IPCC, (c) Climate Refugees, and (d) Doñana calculated on the top 20 users of each community.

the set of users that retweeted it, their chamber C_i is the set of users retweeted by audience A_i . We focus on the two communities with opposing political biases, specifically the top 20 users with the most retweets in each of those communities. The first quantity we will analyse is the chamber overlap between a user i and a user j given by

$$q_{ij} = \frac{C_i \cap C_j}{C_i \cup C_j},\tag{6}$$

where C_i and C_j are the chambers of users *i* and *j*. It is worth noting that the quantity q_{ij} is symmetric by definition and is equal to 1 when chambers are identical and 0 when they are completely different.

In Fig. 6, we show the chamber overlap distribution $P(q_{ij})$, where a notable disparity between networks is observed. A strong bimodal distribution suggests the presence of echo chambers, as each user has low values of q_{ij} with users outside its echo chamber and high values with those inside it. The results from the COP27 and Climate Refugees datasets suggest that leaders have more heterogeneous chambers compared to the IPCC and Doñana datasets, where we observe a peak for high chamber overlap. The Doñana dataset features a strong echo chamber effect with two separated peaks at low and high values of q_{ij} . In Fig. S9, we have performed hierarchical clustering of the top 20 users per community based on the similarity of their chambers, showing a strong alignment between the communities detected.

B. Hashtag analysis

Next, we inspect the patterns of hashtags shared in each network, focusing on the two largest communities with opposing biases. We report in Fig. S10 the top hashtags per network, where we show that despite the ideological confrontation, they share a large number of them. The mainstream communities use rather generalistic hashtags such as #COP27, #IPCC, #climatechange, #ar6, or #climatereport. The results suggest that the users of the right-biased community use common hashtags to attract the attention of mainstream users. In the case of the Doñana, we observe hashtags related to the environment as #donana, #donanaseextingue, or #salvemosdonana for the mainstream community. The community with right bias has hashtags related to rightwing parties as #teamvox, or against the left-wing government as #gobiernodimision. Common hashtags between communities are less frequent in the Doñana dataset in line with the more pronounced echo chambers detected.

To compute the hashtag polarization, we calculated the fraction of tweets with each hashtag by community given by

$$P_i^{\#} = \frac{N_i^r - N_i^l}{N_i^l + N_i^r},\tag{7}$$

where N_i^l and N_i^r are the number of tweets with the hashtag *i* in the main left and right-wing communities, respectively. We display the polarization of the top hashtags in Fig. 7. The number of hashtags in each network varies since we have considered the 20 most shared in each community, and some of them can overlap. Interestingly, we observe only a few hashtags with values close to 0, suggesting a strong polarization in the use of hashtags. In the IPCC and COP27 datasets, the mainstream community dominates most of the hashtags, while the community spreading a counter-narrative dominates only a few hashtags related to the denial of climate change that include #climatehoax or #agenda2030. In COP27, we also observe hashtags related to hypocrisy as #greenwash. In the Doñana network, we also observe only a few hashtags close to zero and hashtags almost equally divided between +1 and -1. We have analysed the chamber overlap of hashtag dynamics in Fig. S11.

III. YOUTUBE ANALYSIS

We have analysed the dataset created from the YouTube videos quoted and referenced on Twitter. The information gathered for each post includes the transcription and description of each video, the corresponding channel, and the user comments. The comment information allows us to create a bipartite network between users and posts since we know the users who have commented on each video. We can project the bipartite network into a post network or a user network. In the post network, the weight corresponds to the number of users in common and, in the user network, to the posts in common. The graphs are undirected by construction in both cases. In Fig. S12, we display the network between YouTube posts for each dataset. We performed a community analysis using the greedy optimisation of modularity on the weighted network [75]. The organisation of communities is complex and fuzzy with several interconnections except for the Doñana network,



FIG. 7. Hashtag polarization. Polarization around hashtags for (a) COP27, (b) IPCC, (c) Climate Refugees, and (d) Doñana. Negative and positive values correspond to hashtags more abundant in the left-biased and right-biased communities, respectively.

where communities 0 and 1 have a clear separation. By inspecting the videos with a large weighted degree, we have identified the communities with mainly climate change sceptics: community 2 in COP27, communities 1 and 2 in IPCC, community 2 in Climate Refugees, and community 0 in Doñana (Fig. S13).

Despite the communities being more separated, there is a strong interaction between them, indicating a certain level of engagement with opposed content. The exception is the Doñana network, where communities exhibit a clear separation, aligning with the pronounced polarization observed in the corresponding Twitter network. We computed polarization indices on the subnetworks using modularity and EI indices, similar to our approach for Twitter (Fig. 8). Only the COP27

and Doñana networks show higher levels of polarization compared to the others. Overall, despite confronting views on climate change, the interaction between posts remains robust. We conducted a sentiment and emotion analysis of the comments by the community (Fig. 9), revealing that negative comments dominate all posts. However, the posts related to sceptic content feature higher negative sentiments, together with more anger and disgust emotions. The sentiment and emotions of comments were calculated following [82]



FIG. 8. Polarization in the Youtube dataset. Quantification of polarization in the post network through (a) modularity (b) E-I index and (c) adaptive E-I index. We have calculated the indices in the real networks and in 100 randomisations where we preserve the degree sequences.

We projected the bipartite graph into a user network to analyse the system from an individual interaction perspective. In Fig. S14, we plot the user interaction, where we focus on the comments of users within the posts of the sceptics and mainstream communities that we have previously separated. Each node corresponds to a user, and the colour to the community according to the greedy modularity optimisation. Despite the users being split into several communities, most of them fall into two to three large communities, which suggests a certain level of polarization. For instance, most users fall within the three largest communities for COP27.

We computed the polarization in the user network by splitting it into two parts using the METIS algorithm and calculating the values in the configuration graphs. Unlike in the post networks, we observe clear signs of polarization in all the networks (Fig. S15). Despite the strong interaction between posts with different views, it is clear that the comment patterns of users are highly polarized. If we aim to measure the polarization between individuals, the user network is the best approximation.

We computed the ideology distribution of users by analysing the communities where they post comments. Focusing on the users with four or more comments, we calculated each user's ideology as the average ideology of the videos they commented on, weighted by the size of each community to address any imbalances. We considered the mainstream community equal to 1, and the sceptic community equal to 0. Both distributions are normalised separately. Overall, they point out that there is a clear separation in the ideology of users according to the posts where they have commented.



FIG. 9. Average sentiment of comments in YouTube posts by community. Average sentiment and emotions: (a) COP27, (b) IPCC, (c) Climate Refugees, and (d) Doñana split by mainstream and sceptic communities.

IV. CROSS-PLATFORM ANALYSIS

Finally, we conducted an analysis linking Twitter and YouTube social media platforms. We computed the frequency with which each Twitter community references YouTube posts and their corresponding communities. To address the heterogeneity in community sizes observed in the YouTube dataset, we normalised the number of references to each YouTube community by the community size. Fig. 11 illustrates a strong connection between Twitter and YouTube communities, as most references in each Twitter community align with a specific YouTube community. Additionally, each Twitter community demonstrates a unique pattern of references to YouTube.



FIG. 10. Distribution of user ideology in Youtube. Average ideology of the users split between mainstream and sceptic ideas in (a) COP27, (b) IPCC, (c) Climate Refugees, and (d) Doñana. We assigned an ideology to each user according to the most common community of its comments.

In the COP27 network, the larger left-biased Twitter community predominantly references the YouTube community 0, while the larger right-biased community solely references posts in the YouTube community 1. Conversely, in the IPCC network, the larger right-biased community references various YouTube communities, indicating that sceptic YouTube posts are dispersed across different communities. Except for the IPCC network, posts shared by the larger right-biased community on Twitter predominantly align with a single YouTube community. Furthermore, sceptic posts on YouTube receive minimal references from other Twitter communities.

To inspect in detail the patterns of YouTube post sharing, we conducted a similar analysis to the echo chamber methodology developed for the Twitter datasets. Using the community assignment of posts between sceptics and mainstream, labelled as 0 and 1 respectively, we computed the average



FIG. 11. Interaction between Twitter and Youtube communities. Number of references to YouTube communities by the top 10 Twitter communities in (a) COP27, (b) IPCC, (c) Climate Refugees, and (d) Doñana. To account for the uneven size of YouTube communities, we have divided the counts by the YouTube community size.

ideology of users and their neighbourhoods. The density plot in Fig. 12 has clearly defined echo chambers, with two centres on opposite sides of the spectrum. These results suggest that users close to each other share similar content. However, there are differences across the typology of videos shared, as users who share sceptical videos also share mainstream videos to some extent.



FIG. 12. Twitter echo chambers in the sharing of YouTube links. Density plots of the average ideology of the videos shared by the neighbours of a user as a function of its average ideology.

V. DISCUSSION

In this study, we have assessed the dynamics of polarization and echo chambers on climate change discussions around four different events. Our findings reveal that the extent and nature of polarization can vary significantly depending not only on the specific topic but also on contextual factors. Interestingly, we noted an over-representation of left-biased media in all datasets except one, indicating the dominance of left-leaning perspectives in climate change discussions, possibly affecting media attention from right-aligned outlets. In discussions more directly related to partisan political contexts, such as Doñana and COP27, we observed a stronger polarization and distinct echo chambers than the discussion focused on factual information, centred around the IPCC's Report. This suggests that proximity to partial politics amplifies polarization and the formation of echo chambers within online climate change discourse. This may indicate a dynamic of partian sorting, as already found in the Finnish Twittersphere [77]. Our analysis of echo chambers revealed nuanced findings, particularly regarding interaction types. While the networks of user mentions in COP27 and IPCC discussions showed minimal evidence of echo chambers, retweet networks prominently featured echo chamber dynamics, indicating a higher level of endorsement associated with retweets compared to other interaction types. Expanding our analysis to include YouTube videos referenced in Twitter datasets provided a cross-platform perspective on climate change discourse. We identified unique communities within YouTube videos, separating sceptic perspectives from mainstream content. Interestingly, alignment between Twitter and YouTube communities is strong, with Twitter communities exhibiting distinct preferences for sharing YouTube content, especially for the sceptic community. Thus, indicating the presence of cross-platform echo chambers. Our work suggests that polarization is ubiquitous across social media platforms, although the typology of interactions impacts the overall polarization.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The Twitter data are made available in accordance with Twitter's terms of service at https://github.com/clint-project/clint-data and the codes to calculate the metrics at https://github.com/clint-project/polarization_metrics.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION

A.B: data collection, data curation, investigation, methodology, visualization; J.M.: data collection, data curation, investigation, methodology. E.C.: conceptualization, investigation, methodology, writing; J.V.: conceptualization, investigation, methodology, writing. All authors gave final approval for publication and agreed to be held accountable for the work performed therein.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

J.M. was a fellow of Eurecat's "Vicente López" PhD grant program. This work was financially supported by the Catalan Government through the funding grant ACCIÓ-Eurecat (Project TRAÇA 2023 - CLINT). E.C. acknowledges support from the Spanish grants PGC2018-094754-B-C22 and PID2021-128005NB-C22, funded by MCIN/AEL 10.13039/501100011033 and "ERDF A way of making Europe", and from Generalitat de Catalunya under project 2021-SGR-00856.

J. McCoy, T. Rahman, and M. Somer, Polarization and the global crisis of democracy: Common patterns, dynamics, and pernicious consequences for democratic polities, American Behavioral Scientist 62, 16–42 (2018).

- [2] Y. M. Rocha, G. A. de Moura, G. A. Desidério, C. H. de Oliveira, F. D. Lourenço, and L. D. de Figueiredo Nicolete, The impact of fake news on social media and its influence on health during the covid-19 pandemic: A systematic review, Journal of Public Health, 1 (2021).
- [3] N. Mheidly and J. Fares, Leveraging media and health communication strategies to overcome the covid-19 infodemic, Journal of Public Health Policy 41, 410–420 (2020).
- [4] R. Gallotti, F. Valle, N. Castaldo, P. Sacco, and M. De Domenico, Assessing the risks of 'infodemics' in response to covid-19 epidemics, Nature Human Behaviour 4, 1285–1293 (2020).
- [5] A. Bramson, P. Grim, D. J. Singer, W. J. Berger, G. Sack, S. Fisher, C. Flocken, and B. Holman, Understanding polarization: Meanings, measures, and model evaluation, Philosophy of science 84, 115 (2017).
- [6] J.-M. Esteban and D. Ray, On the measurement of polarization, Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society, 819 (1994).
- [7] W. Quattrociocchi, A. Scala, and C. R. Sunstein, Echo chambers on facebook, Available at SSRN 2795110 (2016).
- [8] R. Levy, Social media, news consumption, and polarization: Evidence from a field experiment, American economic review **111**, 831 (2021).
- [9] L. Iandoli, S. Primario, and G. Zollo, The impact of group polarization on the quality of online debate in social media: A systematic literature review, Technological Forecasting and Social Change 170, 120924 (2021).
- [10] A. Acerbi, Cultural evolution in the digital age (Oxford University Press, 2019).
- [11] M. Yarchi, C. Baden, and N. Kligler-Vilenchik, Political polarization on the digital sphere: A crossplatform, over-time analysis of interactional, positional, and affective polarization on social media, Political Communication 38, 98 (2021).
- [12] M. Hohmann, K. Devriendt, and M. Coscia, Quantifying ideological polarization on a network using generalized euclidean distance, Science Advances 9, eabq2044 (2023).
- [13] A. Bessi, F. Zollo, M. Del Vicario, M. Puliga, A. Scala, G. Caldarelli, B. Uzzi, and W. Quattrociocchi, Users polarization on facebook and youtube, PloS one 11, e0159641 (2016).
- [14] H. Hosseinmardi, A. Ghasemian, A. Clauset, D. M. Rothschild, M. Mobius, and D. J. Watts, Evaluating the scale, growth, and origins of right-wing echo chambers on youtube, arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.12843 (2020).
- [15] S. Wu and P. Resnick, Cross-partial discussions on youtube: Conservatives talk to liberals but liberals don't talk to conservatives, in *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, Vol. 15 (2021) pp. 808–819.
- [16] C. M. Fernandes, L. Ademir de Oliveira, M. Motta de Campos, and V. B. Gomes, Political polarization in the brazilian election campaign for the presidency of brazil in 2018: an analysis of the social network instagram, Int'l J. Soc. Sci. Stud. 8, 119 (2020).
- [17] V. R. K. Garimella and I. Weber, A long-term analysis of polarization on twitter, Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media 11, 528–531 (2017).
- [18] I. Waller and A. Anderson, Quantifying social organization and political polarization in online platforms, Nature 600, 264–268 (2021).
- [19] B. Esquirol, L. Prignano, A. Díaz-Guilera, and E. Cozzo, Analyzing user activity on twitter during long-lasting crisis events: a case study of the covid-19 crisis in spain, Social Network Analysis and Mining 14, 73 (2024).
- [20] D. Krackhardt and R. N. Stern, Informal networks and organizational crises: An experimental simulation, Social Psychology Quarterly 51, 123 (1988).
- [21] M. P. Fiorina and S. J. Abrams, Political polarization in the american public, Annual Review of Political Science 11, 563–588 (2008).
- [22] A. Salloum, T. H. Y. Chen, and M. Kivelä, Separating polarization from noise: comparison and normalization of structural polarization measures, Proceedings of the ACM on human-computer interaction 6, 1 (2022).
- [23] M. Conover, J. Ratkiewicz, M. Francisco, B. Gonçalves, F. Menczer, and A. Flammini, Political polarization on twitter, in *Proceedings of the international aaai conference on web and social media*, Vol. 5 (2011) pp. 89–96.

- [24] P. Guerra, W. Meira Jr, C. Cardie, and R. Kleinberg, A measure of polarization on social media networks based on community boundaries, in *Proceedings of the international AAAI conference on web* and social media, Vol. 7 (2013) pp. 215–224.
- [25] A. J. Morales, J. Borondo, J. C. Losada, and R. M. Benito, Measuring political polarization: Twitter shows the two sides of venezuela, Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science 25 (2015).
- [26] K. Garimella, G. D. F. Morales, A. Gionis, and M. Mathioudakis, Quantifying controversy on social media, ACM Transactions on Social Computing 1, 1–27 (2018).
- [27] S. Martin-Gutierrez, J. C. Losada, and R. M. Benito, Multipolar social systems: Measuring polarization beyond dichotomous contexts, Chaos, Solitons & Fractals 169, 113244 (2023).
- [28] F. Zollo, P. K. Novak, M. Del Vicario, A. Bessi, I. Mozetič, A. Scala, G. Caldarelli, and W. Quattrociocchi, Emotional dynamics in the age of misinformation, PloS one 10, e0138740 (2015).
- [29] M. Del Vicario, G. Vivaldo, A. Bessi, F. Zollo, A. Scala, G. Caldarelli, and W. Quattrociocchi, Echo chambers: Emotional contagion and group polarization on facebook, Scientific reports 6, 37825 (2016).
- [30] S. Du and S. Gregory, The echo chamber effect in twitter: does community polarization increase?, in Complex Networks & Their Applications V: Proceedings of the 5th International Workshop on Complex Networks and their Applications (COMPLEX NETWORKS 2016) (Springer, 2017) pp. 373–378.
- [31] M. Cinelli, G. De Francisci Morales, A. Galeazzi, W. Quattrociocchi, and M. Starnini, The echo chamber effect on social media, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 118, e2023301118 (2021).
- [32] N. Di Marco, M. Cinelli, and W. Quattrociocchi, Infodemics on youtube: Reliability of content and echo chambers on covid-19, arXiv e-prints, arXiv (2021).
- [33] K. Grusauskaite, L. Carbone, J. Harambam, and S. Aupers, Debating (in) echo chambers: How culture shapes communication in conspiracy theory networks on youtube, New Media & Society, 14614448231162585 (2023).
- [34] W. Cota, S. C. Ferreira, R. Pastor-Satorras, and M. Starnini, Quantifying echo chamber effects in information spreading over political communication networks, EPJ Data Sci. 8 (2019).
- [35] F. Baumann, P. Lorenz-Spreen, I. M. Sokolov, and M. Starnini, Modeling echo chambers and polarization dynamics in social networks, Physical Review Letters 124, 048301 (2020).
- [36] X. Wang, A. D. Sirianni, S. Tang, Z. Zheng, and F. Fu, Public discourse and social network echo chambers driven by socio-cognitive biases, Physical Review X 10, 041042 (2020).
- [37] J. Cho, S. Ahmed, M. Hilbert, B. Liu, and J. Luu, Do search algorithms endanger democracy? an experimental investigation of algorithm effects on political polarization, Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media 64, 150 (2020).
- [38] F. P. Santos, Y. Lelkes, and S. A. Levin, Link recommendation algorithms and dynamics of polarization in online social networks, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 118, e2102141118 (2021).
- [39] H. F. de Arruda, F. M. Cardoso, G. F. de Arruda, A. R. Hernández, L. da Fontoura Costa, and Y. Moreno, Modelling how social network algorithms can influence opinion polarization, Information Sciences 588, 265 (2022).
- [40] F. Zollo, A. Bessi, M. Del Vicario, A. Scala, G. Caldarelli, L. Shekhtman, S. Havlin, and W. Quattrociocchi, Debunking in a world of tribes, PloS one 12, e0181821 (2017).
- [41] U. K. Ecker, S. Lewandowsky, J. Cook, P. Schmid, L. K. Fazio, N. Brashier, P. Kendeou, E. K. Vraga, and M. A. Amazeen, The psychological drivers of misinformation belief and its resistance to correction, Nature Reviews Psychology 1, 13 (2022).
- [42] M. Del Vicario, A. Bessi, F. Zollo, F. Petroni, A. Scala, G. Caldarelli, H. E. Stanley, and W. Quattrociocchi, The spreading of misinformation online, Proceedings of the national academy of Sciences 113, 554 (2016).
- [43] C. Soon and S. Goh, Fake news, false information and more: countering human biases, Institute of Policy Studies (IPS) Working Papers 31 (2018).
- [44] Y. Zhou and L. Shen, Confirmation bias and the persistence of misinformation on climate change, Communication Research 49, 500 (2022).
- [45] M. D. Vicario, W. Quattrociocchi, A. Scala, and F. Zollo, Polarization and fake news: Early warning of potential misinformation targets, ACM Transactions on the Web (TWEB) 13, 1 (2019).
- [46] A. Bovet and H. A. Makse, Influence of fake news in twitter during the 2016 us presidential election, Nature communications 10, 7 (2019).

- [47] N. Grinberg, K. Joseph, L. Friedland, B. Swire-Thompson, and D. Lazer, Fake news on twitter during the 2016 u.s. presidential election, Science 363, 374–378 (2019).
- [48] S. Loomba, A. de Figueiredo, S. J. Piatek, K. de Graaf, and H. J. Larson, Measuring the impact of covid-19 vaccine misinformation on vaccination intent in the uk and usa, Nature Human Behaviour 5, 337–348 (2021).
- [49] S. K. Lee, J. Sun, S. Jang, and S. Connelly, Misinformation of covid-19 vaccines and vaccine hesitancy, Scientific Reports 12, 10.1038/s41598-022-17430-6 (2022).
- [50] S. Van der Linden, A. Leiserowitz, S. Rosenthal, and E. Maibach, Inoculating the public against misinformation about climate change, Global challenges 1, 1600008 (2017).
- [51] S. Vosoughi, D. Roy, and S. Aral, The spread of true and false news online, science 359, 1146 (2018).
- [52] J. L. Juul and J. Ugander, Comparing information diffusion mechanisms by matching on cascade size, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 118, e2100786118 (2021).
- [53] L. Lutzke, C. Drummond, P. Slovic, and J. Árvai, Priming critical thinking: Simple interventions limit the influence of fake news about climate change on facebook, Global environmental change 58, 101964 (2019).
- [54] K. M. d. Treen, H. T. Williams, and S. J. O'Neill, Online misinformation about climate change, Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change 11, e665 (2020).
- [55] S. K. Dash, R. K. Jenamani, S. Kalsi, and S. K. Panda, Some evidence of climate change in twentiethcentury india, Climatic change 85, 299 (2007).
- [56] K. E. Trenberth, Changes in precipitation with climate change, Climate research 47, 123 (2011).
- [57] G. Foster and S. Rahmstorf, Global temperature evolution 1979–2010, Environmental research letters 6, 044022 (2011).
- [58] D. Coumou and S. Rahmstorf, A decade of weather extremes, Nature climate change 2, 491 (2012).
- [59] P. Pall, T. Aina, D. A. Stone, P. A. Stott, T. Nozawa, A. G. Hilberts, D. Lohmann, and M. R. Allen, Anthropogenic greenhouse gas contribution to flood risk in england and wales in autumn 2000, Nature 470, 382 (2011).
- [60] E. M. Fischer and R. Knutti, Anthropogenic contribution to global occurrence of heavy-precipitation and high-temperature extremes, Nature climate change 5, 560 (2015).
- [61] K. Li, D. J. Jacob, H. Liao, L. Shen, Q. Zhang, and K. H. Bates, Anthropogenic drivers of 2013–2017 trends in summer surface ozone in china, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 116, 422 (2019).
- [62] R. J. Rocque, C. Beaudoin, R. Ndjaboue, L. Cameron, L. Poirier-Bergeron, R.-A. Poulin-Rheault, C. Fallon, A. C. Tricco, and H. O. Witteman, Health effects of climate change: an overview of systematic reviews, BMJ open 11, e046333 (2021).
- [63] O. Deschênes and M. Greenstone, The economic impacts of climate change: evidence from agricultural output and random fluctuations in weather, American economic review **97**, 354 (2007).
- [64] C. Aydinalp and M. S. Cresser, The effects of global climate change on agriculture, American-Eurasian Journal of Agricultural & Environmental Sciences 3, 672 (2008).
- [65] J. P. McCarty, Ecological consequences of recent climate change, Conservation biology 15, 320 (2001).
- [66] M. Falkenberg, A. Galeazzi, M. Torricelli, N. Di Marco, F. Larosa, M. Sas, A. Mekacher, W. Pearce, F. Zollo, W. Quattrociocchi, *et al.*, Growing polarization around climate change on social media, Nature Climate Change **12**, 1114 (2022).
- [67] D. R. Fisher, J. Waggle, and P. Leifeld, Where does political polarization come from? locating polarization within the us climate change debate, American Behavioral Scientist **57**, 70 (2013).
- [68] T. H. Y. Chen, A. Salloum, A. Gronow, T. Ylä-Anttila, and M. Kivelä, Polarization of climate politics results from partian sorting: Evidence from finnish twittersphere, Global Environmental Change 71, 102348 (2021).
- [69] S. Chinn, P. S. Hart, and S. Soroka, Politicization and polarization in climate change news content, 1985-2017, Science Communication 42, 112–129 (2020).
- [70] J. Farrell, Corporate funding and ideological polarization about climate change, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 113, 92 (2016).

- [71] M. Torricelli, M. Falkenberg, A. Galeazzi, F. Zollo, W. Quattrociocchi, and A. Baronchelli, How does extreme weather impact the climate change discourse? insights from the twitter discussion on hurricanes, Plos Climate 2, e0000277 (2023).
- [72] E. Summers, I. Brigadir, S. Hames, H. v. Kemenade, P. Binkley, Tinafigueroa, N. Ruest, Walmir, D. Chudnov, D. Thiel, and et al., Docnow/twarc: V2.14.0 (2023).
- [73] G. Karypis and V. Kumar, A fast and high quality multilevel scheme for partitioning irregular graphs, SIAM Journal on scientific Computing 20, 359 (1998).
- [74] A. S. Waugh, L. Pei, J. H. Fowler, P. J. Mucha, and M. A. Porter, Party polarization in congress: A social networks approach, arXiv preprint arXiv:0907.3509 3, 69 (2009).
- [75] M. E. Newman, Modularity and community structure in networks, Proceedings of the national academy of sciences 103, 8577 (2006).
- [76] D. Krackhardt and R. N. Stern, Informal networks and organizational crises: An experimental simulation, Social psychology quarterly, 123 (1988).
- [77] T. H. Y. Chen, A. Salloum, A. Gronow, T. Ylä-Anttila, and M. Kivelä, Polarization of climate politics results from partian sorting: Evidence from finnish twittersphere, Global Environmental Change 71, 102348 (2021).
- [78] B. K. Fosdick, D. B. Larremore, J. Nishimura, and J. Ugander, Configuring random graph models with fixed degree sequences, Siam Review 60, 315 (2018).
- [79] Media bias/fact check, https://mediabiasfactcheck.com/, accessed: 2024-06-30.
- [80] Political watch, https://politicalwatch.es/, accessed: 2024-06-30.
- [81] B. Kolic, F. Aguirre-López, S. Hernández-Williams, and G. Garduño-Hernández, Quantifying the structure of controversial discussions with unsupervised methods: a look into the twitter climate change conversation, arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.14501 (2022).
- [82] J. M. Pérez, J. C. Giudici, and F. Luque, pysentimiento: A python toolkit for sentiment analysis and socialnlp tasks, arXiv e-prints, arXiv (2021).

Appendix A: Dataset description

In this paper, we employed Twarc, a tool for collecting data from Twitter, to delve into usergenerated content. By utilising hashtags as search queries, particularly the search and stream API, we collected Twitter conversations, targeting specific themes and topics relevant to our study (COP27, IPCC, Climate Refugees, and Doñana). This methodological approach facilitated the systematic collection of rich and diverse data. These are the specific hashtags that we utilised to build the datasets:

- **COP27**: COP27, TogetherForImplementation, COPTV, PRECOP, PRECOP27, LossAndDamage, Egypt_COP27, COP27Egypt, ClimateAction, ClimateCrisis, ClimateJustice.
- **IPCC**: ipcc, @ipcc_ch.
- Climate Refugees: climate (refugees OR refugee), climate migration, climate displaced.
- Doñana: Doñana.
- COP27: COP27, climate, COP
- **IPCC**: IPCC, report, climate.
- Climate Refugees: Refugee, climate.
- Doñana: Doñana, clima.

In Fig. S1 and Fig. S2 we show the timeseries of each dataset for Twitter and YouTube, respectively.



FIG. S1. Timeseries of the COP27, IPCC, Climate Refugees and Doñana datasets. Daily timeseries of tweets in the datasets gathered for COP27, IPCC, Climate Refugees and Doñana.



FIG. S2. **Timeseries of comments in the Youtube datasets.** Number of comments per date in the Youtube datasets of COP27, IPCC, Climate Refugees and Doñana. For visualization purposes, we show the comments after 2021.

Appendix B: Influencers by community

We report in Tables S1, S2, S3 and S4 the top influencers by community for the COP27, IPCC, Climate Refugees, and Doñana datasets, respectively.

User	Community	Pagerank	Inflow	In-degree	Outflow	Out-degree	Flow ratio	Degree ratio
MikeHudema	0	0.004604	126323	42099	12	8	0.999905	0.999810
COP27P	0	0.008392	108582	45664	380	142	0.996513	0.996900
antonioguterres	0	0.006937	79507	38380	5	5	0.999937	0.999870
UN	0	0.003134	43045	24757	211	56	0.995122	0.997743
JamesMelville	1	0.007062	49172	31076	8	5	0.999837	0.999839
DiEM_25	1	0.005087	28848	28496	11	6	0.999619	0.999789
BernieSpofforth	1	0.002298	26501	15218	21	10	0.999208	0.999343
DrEliDavid	1	0.000952	13377	11137	0	0	1.000000	1.000000
kimpaim	2	0.001172	24266	18407	2	2	0.999918	0.999891
TerraBrasilnot	2	0.001122	16518	12962	0	0	1.000000	1.000000
VemPraRua_br	2	0.000899	16234	13991	0	0	1.000000	1.000000
marciolabre	2	0.000652	13147	13028	0	0	1.000000	1.000000
LulaOficial	3	0.010655	130064	38689	24	10	0.999816	0.999742
choquei	3	0.005587	25475	14922	1	1	0.999961	0.999933
Reuters	3	0.001247	12269	8240	67	13	0.994569	0.998425
MarinaSilva	3	0.002625	11904	8575	11	6	0.999077	0.999301
CarolineLucas	4	0.001137	33989	14931	40	31	0.998825	0.997928
NicolaSturgeon	4	0.000565	10778	4993	59	25	0.994556	0.995018
_david_ho_	4	0.000498	6706	6246	8	8	0.998808	0.998721
johnestevens	4	0.000809	6553	6154	2	2	0.999695	0.999675
RishiSunak	5	0.005127	37770	24640	3	3	0.999921	0.999878
EmmanuelMacron	5	0.003232	16585	12178	2	2	0.999879	0.999836
Poulin2012	5	0.001389	12919	12735	3	3	0.999768	0.999764
MickaCorreia	5	0.000466	3869	3054	45	19	0.988503	0.993817
POTUS	6	0.004068	24808	15824	1	1	0.999960	0.999937
SpeakerPelosi	6	0.000971	9494	5361	9	6	0.999053	0.998882
JustinTrudeau	6	0.000316	5750	4247	2	2	0.999652	0.999529
washingtonpost	6	0.001279	5564	4655	14	2	0.997490	0.999571
Novozymes	7	0.000194	7735	3629	16	10	0.997936	0.997252
AfDB_Group	7	0.000376	5991	2294	358	104	0.943613	0.956631
RockefellerFdn	7	0.000438	5845	3381	346	118	0.944112	0.966276
WilliamsRuto	7	0.000691	4941	3163	9	4	0.998182	0.998737
Danielbricen	8	0.001689	12626	7694	4	2	0.999683	0.999740
IvanDuque	8	0.000791	9105	6317	1	1	0.999890	0.999842
alertaLatam	8	0.000337	6695	4717	17	3	0.997467	0.999364
marcelamvzyya	8	0.000140	5918	3507	0	0	1.000000	1.000000
petrogustavo	9	0.005749	54899	24016	23	14	0.999581	0.999417
infopresidencia	9	0.001116	18209	6575	60	17	0.996716	0.997421
FranciaMarquezM	9	0.000399	10795	5306	22	17	0.997966	0.996806
GustavoBolivar	9	0.001154	8534	6545	7	2	0.999180	0.999695

TABLE S1.	Top 5 most i	relevant users	by total	inflow	in the ten	largest	communities	of the (COP27 dataset
	*		0			0			

User	Community	Pagerank	Inflow	In-degree	Outflow	Out-degree	Flow ratio	Degree ratio
IPCC_CH	0	0.173282	86702	48491	22	12	0.999746	0.999753
ed_hawkins	0	0.002570	3194	2119	60	29	0.981561	0.986499
MrMatthewTodd	0	0.001954	2766	2474	54	37	0.980851	0.985265
CharlieJGardner	0	0.002120	2720	2297	5	4	0.998165	0.998262
uksciencechief	1	0.004402	12700	5452	1	1	0.999921	0.999817
BernieSpofforth	1	0.005600	5735	4972	0	0	1.000000	1.000000
fmeeus1	1	0.004689	3973	1800	15	8	0.996239	0.995575
Lauratobin1	1	0.000858	3067	1287	4	3	0.998697	0.997674
jasonhickel	2	0.008178	4249	4120	2	2	0.999530	0.999515
greenpeace_esp	2	0.003291	2092	1986	28	11	0.986792	0.994492
millares	2	0.001390	1788	1786	5	4	0.997211	0.997765
ionebelarra	2	0.000286	592	444	3	3	0.994958	0.993289
GretaThunberg	3	0.007815	8539	8115	0	0	1.000000	1.000000
CarolineLucas	3	0.003437	5833	3971	5	5	0.999144	0.998742
paulpowlesland	3	0.001666	1189	1179	0	0	1.000000	1.000000
guardian	3	0.000646	1016	915	0	0	1.000000	1.000000
KHayhoe	4	0.006960	9241	7626	82	39	0.991205	0.994912
SenSchumer	4	0.001571	4078	1973	2	2	0.999510	0.998987
curious_founder	4	0.004436	2067	1779	9	5	0.995665	0.997197
$remblance_erin$	4	0.001244	1380	1325	9	9	0.993521	0.993253
rahmstorf	5	0.003506	3135	2032	35	17	0.988959	0.991703
micha_bloss	5	0.007133	2687	2276	3	2	0.998885	0.999122
Martin_Bethke	5	0.001183	2124	1222	71	40	0.967654	0.968304
HolzheuStefan	5	0.001040	1787	1241	26	13	0.985659	0.989633
antonioguterres	6	0.015073	6512	4285	1	1	0.999846	0.999767
UN	6	0.007672	4093	2753	8	2	0.998049	0.999274
BarackObama	6	0.002001	1794	1775	0	0	1.000000	1.000000
HillaryClinton	6	0.001469	1398	1375	0	0	1.000000	1.000000
JKSteinberger	7	0.006622	2121	1930	76	26	0.965407	0.986708
frantecol	7	0.001867	2101	2052	6	4	0.997152	0.998054
jennystojkovic	7	0.000888	1519	1324	8	4	0.994761	0.996988
NLRebellion	7	0.000375	571	407	26	17	0.956449	0.959906
MikeHudema	8	0.003279	5639	3757	1	1	0.999823	0.999734
$s_guilbeault$	8	0.001042	2369	1082	4	2	0.998314	0.998155
tveitdal	8	0.000368	561	409	35	7	0.941275	0.983173
gmbutts	8	0.000383	512	406	4	3	0.992248	0.992665
DrLuetke	9	0.000737	741	719	0	0	1.000000	1.000000
Axel_Bojanowski	9	0.001738	561	406	11	3	0.980769	0.992665
welt	9	0.000674	543	471	2	1	0.996330	0.997881
Schlautropf	9	0.000378	419	375	14	12	0.967667	0.968992

TABLE S2. Top 5 most relevant users by total inflow in the ten largest communities of the IPCC dataset

User	Community	Pagerank	Inflow	In-degree	Outflow	Out-degree	Flow ratio	Degree ratio
AOC	0	0.012350	35741	31238	9	7	0.999748	0.999776
BernieSanders	0	0.002378	12756	11197	2	2	0.999843	0.999821
propublica	0	0.003287	12325	8952	87	33	0.992991	0.996327
POTUS	0	0.003139	8389	7316	0	0	1.000000	1.000000
MikeHudema	1	0.002022	12798	10474	13	8	0.998985	0.999237
AssaadRazzouk	1	0.002807	10615	7388	44	31	0.995872	0.995822
PaulEDawson	1	0.000761	10559	5675	15	8	0.998581	0.998592
ClimateBen	1	0.003454	10327	9121	135	62	0.987096	0.993248
zoenone0none	2	0.011598	24876	24855	3	2	0.999879	0.999920
studentactivism	2	0.011936	19994	19861	2	2	0.999900	0.999899
ajplus	2	0.009282	6795	5790	18	6	0.997358	0.998965
femalekissinger	2	0.001781	5197	5195	1	1	0.999808	0.999808
Refugees	3	0.009205	29470	15697	197	86	0.993360	0.994551
UN	3	0.006119	16457	12513	91	33	0.994501	0.997370
UNmigration	3	0.001623	8475	4151	278	113	0.968239	0.973499
antonioguterres	3	0.002124	6676	5626	0	0	1.000000	1.000000
nytimes	4	0.009325	21229	18971	51	16	0.997603	0.999157
guardian	4	0.002638	7924	6603	9	4	0.998865	0.999395
LeoDiCaprio	4	0.001235	5447	4897	9	9	0.998350	0.998166
NatGeo	4	0.001027	5283	4718	0	0	1.000000	1.000000
MrAhmednurAli	5	0.002175	11799	11703	1	1	0.999915	0.999915
jeremycorbyn	5	0.003088	6753	5402	3	2	0.999556	0.999630
LaylaMoran	5	0.000665	3725	3711	0	0	1.000000	1.000000
bmay	5	0.000566	3383	3029	15	13	0.995586	0.995726
BreitbartNews	6	0.000559	3076	2481	0	0	1.000000	1.000000
MaximeBernier	6	0.000966	2799	2022	17	11	0.993963	0.994589
PrisonPlanet	6	0.001274	1912	1711	1	1	0.999477	0.999416
Liz_Wheeler	6	0.000363	1810	1787	0	0	1.000000	1.000000
Kon_K	7	0.001581	9741	6362	46	24	0.995300	0.996242
bruce_haigh	7	0.000417	4512	2721	115	86	0.975146	0.969362
simonahac	7	0.000289	2775	2060	58	47	0.979527	0.977693
abcnews	7	0.000239	2051	1671	2	2	0.999026	0.998805
JustinTrudeau	8	0.003543	15733	15066	5	5	0.999682	0.999668
ianbremmer	8	0.000955	4529	4469	9	4	0.998017	0.999106
cjwerleman	8	0.000434	1052	1017	3	3	0.997156	0.997059
MusaNV18	8	0.000294	931	877	4	3	0.995722	0.996591
ndcodeine	9	0.006104	24228	24205	0	0	1.000000	1.000000
RoadtoMUT2022	9	0.000038	157	157	0	0	1.000000	1.000000
chloeprw	9	0.000016	71	71	0	0	1.000000	1.000000
the momentum co	9	0.000009	40	40	0	0	1.000000	1.000000

TABLE S3. Top 5 most relevant users by total inflow in the ten largest communities of the Climate Refugees dataset

User	Community	Pagerank	Inflow	In-degree	Outflow	Out-degree	Flow ratio	Degree ratio
JuanMa_Moreno	0	0.014113	37135	14986	25	8	0.999327	0.999466
alfonso_ussia	0	0.003464	17027	9717	41	30	0.997598	0.996922
okdiario	0	0.003296	13310	5792	44	11	0.996705	0.998104
AndaluciaJunta	0	0.011000	11794	6983	386	66	0.968309	0.990637
WWFespana	1	0.006797	20837	8588	1292	201	0.941615	0.977131
juralde	1	0.005168	19984	9507	363	94	0.982160	0.990209
Santi_MBarajas	1	0.003885	19234	7772	270	65	0.986157	0.991706
SEO_BirdLife	1	0.004740	10059	4557	499	138	0.952737	0.970607
FonsiLoaiza	2	0.009273	13695	9416	5	1	0.999635	0.999894
JA_DelgadoRamos	2	0.002128	10446	5413	23	12	0.997803	0.997788
Toni_Valero	2	0.002191	9947	4700	64	27	0.993607	0.994288
JavierArocaA	2	0.001303	8632	4994	84	30	0.990363	0.994029
$TeresaRodr_{-}$	3	0.002844	10018	5616	209	73	0.979564	0.987168
Ainhoasauria	3	0.003481	5677	5676	0	0	1.000000	1.000000
MiguelMorenatti	3	0.001572	4024	3916	5	4	0.998759	0.998980
lavozdelsures	3	0.000936	3343	2414	475	191	0.875589	0.926679
carlosromeroco	4	0.016908	51995	16142	4210	302	0.925096	0.981635
PartidoPACMA	4	0.004616	10101	8238	32	15	0.996842	0.998182
fromerofoto	4	0.001280	4799	1132	887	90	0.844003	0.926350
guardiacivil	4	0.004166	3612	2798	7	2	0.998066	0.999286
sanchezcastejon	5	0.032978	67372	26401	2	2	0.999970	0.999924
eldiarioes	5	0.008312	24556	11979	205	32	0.991721	0.997336
PSOE	5	0.003014	22664	7498	47	15	0.997931	0.998003
iescolar	5	0.006451	21280	10952	6	3	0.999718	0.999726
jcanadellb	6	0.000574	1478	1084	15	8	0.989953	0.992674
sninobecerra	6	0.000243	789	739	0	0	1.000000	1.000000
puntocriticoDH	6	0.000112	675	201	358	16	0.653437	0.926267
jm_clavero	6	0.000113	528	439	1	1	0.998110	0.997727
ClimateBen	7	0.002295	798	740	2	1	0.997500	0.998650
WWF_Deutschland	7	0.000356	246	199	14	5	0.946154	0.975490
iacbe	7	0.000101	173	108	13	7	0.930108	0.939130
AlanDaviesbirds	7	0.000195	158	107	22	10	0.877778	0.914530
ParlamentoAnd	8	0.002065	2855	2335	24	10	0.991664	0.995736
CiudadanosCs	8	0.000200	724	501	24	14	0.967914	0.972816
Cs_Andalucia	8	0.000254	557	440	67	32	0.892628	0.932203
AsocParqueDunar	8	0.000136	430	114	101	26	0.809793	0.814286
GotTalentES	9	0.001144	1618	1617	0	0	1.000000	1.000000
proalmerienses	9	0.000008	22	21	0	0	1.000000	1.000000
RaholaOficial	9	0.000007	22	13	16	16	0.578947	0.448276
chiquisanz	9	0.000001	10	5	308	60	0.031447	0.076923

TABLE S4. Top 5 most relevant users by total inflow in the ten largest communities of the Doñana dataset

1. Language analysis

We report in Tables S5, S6, S7 and S8 the most used languages by community for the COP27, IPCC, Climate Refugees, and Doñana datasets, respectively.

Community Top 1 language	Top 1 language ratio	Top 2 language	Top 2 language ratio
0 en	0.911	de	0.051
$1 \mathrm{en}$	0.860	de	0.060
$2 \mathrm{pt}$	0.980	es	0.011
$3 { m pt}$	0.927	en	0.047
$4 \mathrm{en}$	0.994	fr	0.001
$5 \mathrm{fr}$	0.871	en	0.113
$6 \mathrm{en}$	0.917	pl	0.021
$7 \mathrm{en}$	0.911	fr	0.026
$8 \mathrm{es}$	0.945	en	0.042
$9 \mathrm{es}$	0.926	en	0.061

TABLE S5. Most used languages in the ten largest communities of the COP27 dataset

Community Top 1 language	e Top 1 language ratio	Top 2 language	Top 2 language ratio
0 en	0.985	de	0.003
1 en	0.773	nl	0.180
$2 \mathrm{es}$	0.699	en	0.261
$3 \mathrm{en}$	0.993	de	0.005
4 en	0.985	de	0.005
$5 \mathrm{de}$	0.930	en	0.064
$6 \mathrm{en}$	0.986	es	0.004
$7 \mathrm{en}$	0.647	nl	0.323
8 en	0.791	SV	0.192
$9 \mathrm{de}$	0.955	en	0.043

TABLE S6. Most used languages in the ten largest communities of the IPCC dataset

Community	Top 1 language	Top 1 language ratio	Top 2 language	Top 2 language ratio
0	en	0.998	ro	0.001
1	en	0.987	fi	0.003
2	en	0.990	id	0.009
3	en	0.990	es	0.003
4	en	0.991	it	0.004
5	en	0.998	it	0.001
6	en	0.990	nl	0.004
7	en	0.997	fr	0.002
8	en	0.996	it	0.001
9	$^{\mathrm{th}}$	0.991	en	0.009

TABLE S7. Most used languages in the ten largest communities of the Climate Refugees dataset

Community Top	p 1 language Top 1 la	nguage ratio	Top 2 language	Top 2 language ratio
$0 \mathrm{es}$		0.996	pt	0.001
$1 \mathrm{es}$		0.907	en	0.077
$2 \mathrm{es}$		0.993	ca	0.003
$3 \mathrm{es}$		0.969	pt	0.015
$4 \mathrm{es}$		0.952	pt	0.024
$5 \mathrm{es}$		0.991	en	0.005
6 es		0.635	ca	0.295
$7 \mathrm{en}$		0.609	de	0.283
$8 \mathrm{es}$		0.978	en	0.011
$9 \mathrm{es}$		0.998	pt	0.001

TABLE S8. Most used languages in the ten largest communities of the Doñana dataset

Appendix C: Additional results polarization and entropy in Twitter

In Fig. S3 we report the standarized polarization in the COP27, IPCC, Climate Refugees and Doñana networks calculated following [22] as

$$\hat{\Phi}_{z}(G) = \frac{\Phi(G) - \Phi(G_{CM})}{\sqrt{\langle \Phi(G_{CM})^{2} \rangle - \langle \Phi(G_{CM}) \rangle^{2}}}.$$
(S1)



FIG. S3. Standarized polarization in the Twitter dataset. Standardized measures of polarization in the retweet networks after the denoising and the calculation of z-scores.

In Fig. S4 we show the outflow entropy as a function of the outgoing isolation for the mention network between communities. We also show in Fig. S5 we show the inflow entropy as a function of the incoming isolation for the retweet network between communities.

We have computed in Fig. S6 the polarization scores in the subgraph between the two largest communities with opposing bias that speak the same language.

In Fig. S7 we report the bias echo chambers in the mention network and in Fig. S8 the reliability echo chambers in the retweet network.

The chamber overlap can distinguish between users sharing similar echo chambers (Fig.S9). We constructed the user-to-user matrices where the values correspond to their chamber overlap. Using a hierarchical agglomerative algorithm, we clustered the distance matrix and obtained an almost perfect separation of users by communities. The separation between the users in the communities is more neat in the COP27 and Doñana datasets compared to IPCC and Climate Refugees. Nevertheless, we observe a clear trend of similar echo chambers among users within the same community. In the COP27 network, the pattern is more evident for the users in the mainstream community (in blue). The separation between communities and the matching of echo chambers suggest a clearer separation in the Doñana dataset.

In Fig. S10, we show the 20 most tweeted and retweeted hashtags in the two communities analyzed per network. We observe a large overlap in the most tweeted hashtags between communities with a dominance of the generalistic ones.

Finally, we employ the same approach used to study the chamber overlap to characterize and compare the use of hashtags (Fig. S11). We calculated the weighted Jaccard similarity between hashtags on the fraction of tweets by community. We observe a clear grouping of the hashtags, which is much stronger in the Doñana network, indicating a stronger polarization in the use of hashtags.



FIG. S4. Community connectivity and entropy in mention networks. Outflow entropy as a function of the normalized outgoing connectivity in the mention networks of (a) COP27, (b) IPCC, (c) Climate Refugees, and (d) Doñana. The grey area corresponds to the range of attainable values.



FIG. S5. **Community connectivity and entropy in retweet networks.** Inflow entropy as a function of the normalized incoming connectivity in the retweet networks of COP27, IPCC, Climate Refugees, and Doñana. The grey area corresponds to the range of attainable values.



FIG. S6. Standarized polarization in Twitter by interaction type. Standardized modularity and the E-I indices in (a) the retweet and (b) mention networks. We computed the polarization over the subnetwork of the two largest communities of opposed political bias. We have calculated the indices in the real network, in 100 realizations of the configuration model with preserved degree sequences, and standardized them.



FIG. S7. Detection of echo chambers in the mention network for political bias. Political bias of the neighborhood as a function of the bias of a user in the mention network for (a) COP27, (b) IPCC, (c) Climate Refugees, and (d) Doñana.



FIG. S8. Detection of echo chambers in the retweet network for reliability. Media reliability of the neighborhood as a function of the bias of a user in (a) COP27, (b) IPCC, (c) Climate Refugees, and (d) Doñana. studied by considering only retweets.



FIG. S9. Chamber overlap matrix between users clustered using a hierarchical agglomerative algorithm. Chamber overlap between the 20 users with more retweets in the two largest communities with opposed bias in (a) COP27, (b) IPCC, (c) Climate Refugees, and (d) Doñana.



FIG. S10. Ranking of hashtags by number of interactions in the top two opposing communities. Ranking of hashtags in the two largest communities with opposed political bias in the (a) COP27, (b) IPCC, (c) Climate Refugees, and (d) Doñana networks.



FIG. S11. Hashtag similarity in the COP27, IPCC, Climate Refugees and Doñana datasets. Similarity matrix between the set of top 20 hashtags in each of the two opposed communities. Results for (a) COP27, (b) IPCC, (c) Climate Refugees, and (d) Doñana.

Appendix D: Additional results Youtube

We show in Fig. S12 the network between YouTube posts for each of the datasets analyzed.



FIG. S12. Network of Youtube posts extracted from the Twitter datasets. Each node corresponds to a post and links to the number of co-commenting users. Each node is colored according to the community calculated by optimizing the modularity [75].

We have analyzed the subnetwork focusing on those communities spreading skeptical content on climate change and the larger community with mainstream content, and we report them in Fig. S13.



FIG. S13. Network of YouTube posts after selecting the two main communities of mainstream and skeptics. Interaction between the posts after selecting the larger communities with mainstream and skeptical ideas. We calculated the communities by optimizing the modularity for two partitions. We identified the positioning of the communities by inspecting the videos.



FIG. S14. **Network of YouTube users.** Networks of interactions between YouTube users. The weight of links is the number of common posts, and the color corresponds to the community calculated by the optimization of modularity [75].



FIG. S15. **Polarization in the network of Youtube users.** Quantification of the modularity and EI indices in the user network. We have calculated the indices in the real network and in 100 randomizations where we preserve the degree sequences.