Author's general response

Authors are deeply grateful the great review process of this work on ecoengineering applied to floating wind turbines. We have carefully considered each comment and provide detailed responses below.

- We acknowledge that the initial abstract was overly elaborate and long. In the new version we now condense the contextual material, clearly highlight the paper's major contribution, present the discrete choice experiment (DCE) methodology briefly. We now provide in the manuscript key numeric findings as bundle willingness-to-pay for two scenarios (Sec. 3.3 – Table 6).
- We have clarified the sampling procedure in the manuscript (Sec. 2.2.2). For instance, the company could not formally ensure a balanced distribution of respondents across core socio-demographic factors (*i.e.* age and gender) at the departmental level. Nonetheless, the final sample composition is broadly consistent with INSEE regional demographic data, providing reasonable confidence in the reliability of the results.
- The probable perceived correlation between attributes was one of our concerns before starting the survey. We pre-tested the questionnaire on a small group of people but did not find any perceived correlation between "marine biodiversity" and "local fisheries revenue". In the final survey, we nevertheless broadened the description of the attribute to eliminate any possible perceived link (Sec. 2.2.5.2 & 2.2.5.3).
- Figures were shown to respondents at the beginning of the questionnaire to explain the notion of artificial reef. Moreover, the specific studied concept of the study was shown and described to respondents. Then, a detailed yet succinct description of each attribute on which the artificial reef will have an influence, and their levels was shown. We now include some visualizations (Appendix 2) and the choice cards in the appendices (Appendix 3), which we have translated into English for the purpose of the paper.
- We acknowledge that no explicit attention or dominance test was included. However, we implemented several ex-ante and ex-post checks to support data quality. Ex-ante: We kept the choice cards short, clearly structured, realistically designed and understandable scenarios. The mandated company also respondent quality through strict panel management procedures, including double opt-in registration and individual login requirements that prevent link sharing, ensuring that only verified and engaged panel members participate. Ex-post: We examined response patterns and found very few respondents who systematically chose only option A, only option B, or alternated mechanically (e.g., ABABAB). We have also improved the description of the DCE design and added this limitation (Sec. 2.2.1).

- We acknowledge the coding of the explanatory variables in the ZINB model was lacking. The manuscript now provides the coding of the explanatory variables (Sec. 2.3.2 – Table 2).
- The Wald tests were indeed used to assess whether estimated coefficients for a given attribute differed significantly between departments. In the revised version we now clarified each null hypothesis (H_0) tested in each case was that the coefficients (β) for the same attribute are equal across departments (Sec. 2.3.1, Sec. 3.2 and Sec. 3.3).
- We kept only Table 7 (former Table 6) in the revised version.
- A more moderate interpretation was adopted about the homogeneity of preferences (Sec. 4.1). More generally, the phrasing and comments in the discussion (Sec. 4) were revised because they were too strong.
- We have expanded the DCE description to ensure readability and replicability (Sec. 2.2.1). First of all, we have added an example of choice cards (Appendices 3 & 4) and a full list of attribute levels seen by the individuals, following other DCE study on offshore wind farm. By doing so, the reader knows in details how the choice cards were presented and all the different scenarios that were presented to the participants. We also present in more detail the d-efficient design that was employed, as well as blocking structure and random assignment procedure. Finally, we explain that both the length of the questionnaire and the number of cards per individual were voluntary limited to reduce respondent fatigue. To avoid attribute nonattendance, the description of the attribute was non-technical and understandable to general audience.
- We agree that accounting for preference heterogeneity is important and goes beyond the basic framework of the conditional logit model. While the conditional logit provides a useful benchmark, it relies on restrictive assumptions such as homogeneous preferences and the independence of irrelevant alternatives (IIA). Given the repeated choice structure of our data, these assumptions may be too limiting. In the revised version of the manuscript, we therefore estimate a panel mixed logit model (Sec. 2.3.3 and Sec. 3.6 and Appendices 6 & 7), which allows for unobserved heterogeneity in preferences and accounts for the panel nature of the data, since each respondent completes several choice tasks. To further enrich the analysis, we also explore observed heterogeneity by including interaction terms between the recycle attribute and the geographic department of residence, in order to assess whether the importance attached to this attribute varies across locations. Finally, we opted for the panel mixed logit specification rather than a latent class model. While latent class models identify discrete preference segments, they generally require larger samples to reliably estimate class membership and class-specific parameters. Given our sample size, the mixed logit approach provides a more parsimonious and robust way to capture preference heterogeneity. We chose to include the results and the method used

in the body of the manuscript, but given the similarity of the results and trends, we added the tables in the Appendices.

- We substantially revised the WTP reporting. We now report WTP for policy-relevant increments for two different and pertinent scenarios and for bundled packages combining multiple co-benefits (sections 3.3, 4.1). We compute 95% confidence intervals using the delta method and report them alongside WTP estimates (Table 6). We explicitly clarify in the text and table notes that biodiversity and fisheries attributes enter as percentage changes, so the marginal WTP is expressed per percentage point; we therefore focus reporting on meaningful increments for interpretability (Table 6).
- We corrected the error in Table 6 (“>4 times status quo” in Table 7).
- We removed correlation analysis and associated plots because these results were not anymore central.
- While the ZINB specification was initially used to explore the frequency of status quo choices, we now complement this analysis by integrating status quo behaviour directly within the discrete choice framework. Specifically, the revised panel mixed logit model includes an interaction between the status quo constant (ASC) and respondents’ attitudes toward floating offshore wind. This specification allows the attractiveness of the status quo alternative to vary systematically with respondents’ prior attitudes while remaining fully consistent with the random utility framework. This additional specification provides a robustness check and ensures that systematic differences in the propensity to select the status quo are captured within the choice model itself.