# Supplementary Material C

References of the 534 included studies. Entries are ordered alphabetically by first author; the dataset identifier in square brackets links each study to its record in the structured extraction dataset (Supplementary Material B, extraction_master_v5.csv).


Acheson JM, Acheson AW. Offshore wind power development in Maine: a rational choice perspective. Econ Anthropol 2016;3(1):161–73. https://doi.org/10.1002/sea2.12052. [B6587]

Achterberg P. The changing face of public support for hydrogen technology explaining declining support among the Dutch (2008–2013). Int J Hydrogen Energy 2014;39(33):18711–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2014.08.053. [B717]

Afanasiev A, Kandinskaia O, Eminidou S, Sousanis A. Hydrogen Valley in Cyprus: insights and strategies for citizen engagement. Sustainability 2025;17:804. https://doi.org/10.3390/su17020804. [B890]

Ahern I, Walker C, Roux JP, Chateau Z. Views from the shore: an analysis of public comments on an offshore wind energy future in Nova Scotia, Canada. Can Plan Policy 2025;2025(1):126–51. https://doi.org/10.24908/cpp-apc.v2025i1.18292. [B6908]

Ahlawat N, Pandit RK. Quantifying public perceptions of hydrogen adoption in the United Kingdom incorporating challenges, acceptance factors and proposed strategies. Energy Sci Eng 2025;13(12):6332–45. https://doi.org/10.1002/ese3.70321. [B7908]

Ahmed BM, Fikru MG. Willingness to pay estimates for carbon capture and management: evidence from a pilot choice experiment. Carbon Capture Sci Technol 2025;14:100340. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccst.2024.100340. [B3533]

Ahn J, Lee J. Economic value of accelerating the hydrogen production, transportation, storage and utilisation: integrating techno-economic and socio-political perspectives of hydrogen value chain logistics. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2025;138:928–37. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2025.05.158. [B1073]

Al-Abdulqader KS, Ibrahim AJ, Ong J, Khalifa AA. Environmental consciousness and willingness to pay for carbon emissions reductions: empirical evidence from Qatar. Energies 2025;18(17):4541. https://doi.org/10.3390/en18174541. [B3239]

Allen P, Chatterton T. Carbon reduction scenarios for 2050: an explorative analysis of public preferences. Energy Policy 2013;63:796–808. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2013.08.079. [B4419]

Alsheimer S. Does the public want green hydrogen in industry? Local and national acceptance of methanol and steel transitions in Germany. Energy Res Soc Sci 2025;121:103973. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2025.103973. [B708]

Altstadt L, Reichmann A, Weber N, Witte K. Social acceptance of a hydrogen-driven industrial transition in North Rhine-Westphalia, Germany. Energy Sustain Soc 2026;16:5. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13705-025-00557-5. [B1662]

Anderson C, Schirmer J, Abjorensen N. Exploring CCS community acceptance and public participation from a human and social capital perspective. Mitig Adapt Strateg Glob Change 2011;17(6):687–706. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11027-011-9312-z. [B2435]

Ansari Y, Bansal R, Kar SK. An empirical analysis of Saudi Arabian women’s intentions to adopt hydrogen fuel cell cars. Transp Res Interdiscip Perspect 2024;28:101269. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trip.2024.101269. [B1547]

Ansari Y, Bansal R, Kar SK. An empirical study of Kingdom of Saudi Arabia citizens' intentions about the adoption of hydrogen fuel cell vehicles. Energy Nexus 2025;20:100551. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nexus.2025.100551. [B1470]

Apostolou D, Welcher SN. Prospects of the hydrogen-based mobility in the private vehicle market. A social perspective in Denmark. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2021;46(9):6885–900. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2020.11.167. [B918]

Arlt D, Becker M, Wolling J. Stability, change, formation: insights into the media's role in shaping attitudes toward green hydrogen in Germany. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2025;97:328–37. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2024.11.380. [B743]

Arning K, Engelmann L, Ziefle M. Ready to fly? Comparing acceptance and behavioral usage intentions of CO2-based aviation fuels in four European countries. Front Energy Res 2023;11:1156709. https://doi.org/10.3389/fenrg.2023.1156709. [B2959]

Arning K, Linzenich A, Engelmann L, Ziefle M. More green or less black? How benefit perceptions of CO2 reductions vs. fossil resource savings shape the acceptance of CO2-based fuels and their conversion technology. Energy Clim Change 2021;2:100025. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egycc.2021.100025. [B2639]

Arning K, Linzenich A, Ziefle M, Meuleneers L, Rezo D, von der Aßen N. Eliciting laypeople's mental models and risk perceptions of direct air carbon capture and storage: implications for effective risk communication. Energy Rep 2024;12:1068–79. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egyr.2024.06.070. [B2576]

Arning K, Offermann-van Heek J, Linzenich A, Kaetelhoen A, Sternberg A, Bardow A, et al. Same or different? Insights on public perception and acceptance of carbon capture and storage or utilization in Germany. Energy Policy 2019;125:235–49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2018.10.039. [B2254]

Arning K, Offermann-van Heek J, Sternberg A, Bardow A, Ziefle M. Risk-benefit perceptions and public acceptance of carbon capture and utilization. Environ Innov Soc Transit 2020;35:292–308. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eist.2019.05.003. [B2258]

Arning K, Offermann-van Heek J, Ziefle M. What drives public acceptance of sustainable CO2-derived building materials? A conjoint-analysis of eco-benefits vs. health concerns. Renew Sustain Energy Rev 2021;144:110873. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2021.110873. [B2876]

Arning K, van Heek J, Ziefle M. Acceptance profiles for a carbon-derived foam mattress. Exploring and segmenting consumer perceptions of a carbon capture and utilization product. J Clean Prod 2018;188:171–84. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.03.256. [B2354]

Asayama S, Fujimori S, Oshiro K, Hasegawa T, Shiraki H, Sugiyama M. Conflicted public perceptions of different net-zero mitigation pathways between feasibility and desirability. Commun Sustain 2026;1:22. https://doi.org/10.1038/s44458-025-00021-7. [B3419]

Ashworth P, Sun Y, Ferguson M, Witt K, She S. Comparing how the public perceive CCS across Australia and China. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2019;86:125–33. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2019.04.008. [B2644]

Atkinson L, Dankel DJ, Romanak KD. The effect of monitoring complexity on stakeholder acceptance of CO2 geological storage projects in the US gulf coast region. Front Mar Sci 2024;10:1154543. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2023.1154543. [B3011]

Attitudes of Greek university students towards energy and the environment. Glob NEST J 2014;16(5):856–65. https://doi.org/10.30955/gnj.001527. [B2892]

Avrami L, Kaminiaris O, Mela K, Demertzis N. Local communities' perceptions of offshore wind farms in Greece: evidence from the Diapontian Islands. Ocean Soc 2026;3:11539. https://doi.org/10.17645/oas.11539. [B6725]

Azarova V, Cohen J, Friedl C, Reichl J. Designing local renewable energy communities to increase social acceptance: evidence from a choice experiment in Austria, Germany, Italy, and Switzerland. Energy Policy 2019;132:1176–83. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2019.06.067. [B462]

Bai Y, Zhou X, Tan J, Ding X. Exploring dynamic attitudes to hydrogen energy vehicles: evidence from China’s media. Transp Res Part D Transp Environ 2026;150:105120. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2025.105120. [B855]

Barbier L, Agnoletti MF. Are French people ready to accept hydrogen underground storage? An answer through the distance from object model. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2023;48(52):19792–802. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2023.02.077. [B10383]

Batchelder E, McClenachan L, Bates A. The power of place: the role of place attachment in the offshore wind debate in the Gulf of Maine. Mar Policy 2026;186:107002. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2025.107002. [B6837]

Bates A, Doore SA, Rothwell E, Doore S. Trust, fairness, and transparency: perceptions of energy justice in Maine's offshore wind planning process. Energy Res Soc Sci 2025;127:104286. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2025.104286. [B6421]

Bates A, Firestone J. A comparative assessment of proposed offshore wind power demonstration projects in the United States. Energy Res Soc Sci 2015;10:192–205. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2015.07.007. [B6354]

Baum CM, Brutschin E, Fritz L, Sovacool BK. A new hope or phantom menace? Exploring climate emotions and public support for climate interventions across 30 countries. Risk Anal 2025;45(8):2323–40. https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.17713. [B3167]

Baum CM, Fritz L, Low S, Sovacool BK. Public perceptions and support of climate intervention technologies across the Global North and Global South. Nat Commun 2024;15:2060. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-46341-5. [B2493]

Baur D, Emmerich P, Baumann MJ, Weil M. Assessing the social acceptance of key technologies for the German energy transition. Energy Sustain Soc 2022;12:4. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13705-021-00329-x. [B629]

Beasy K, Ajulo O, Emery S, Lodewyckx S, Lloyd C, Islam A. Advancing a hydrogen economy in Australia: public perceptions and aspirations. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2024;55:199–207. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2023.11.165. [B576]

Beasy K, Lodewyckx S, Mattila P. Industry perceptions and community perspectives on advancing a hydrogen economy in Australia. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2023;48(23):8386–97. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2022.11.230. [B528]

Bellamy R, Lezaun J, Palmer J. Perceptions of bioenergy with carbon capture and storage in different policy scenarios. Nat Commun 2019;10:743. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-08592-5. [B2271]

Bellamy R. Mapping public appraisals of carbon dioxide removal. Glob Environ Change 2022;76:102593. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2022.102593. [B2377]

Bentsen HL, Skiple JK, Gregersen T, Derempouka E, Skjold T. In the green? Perceptions of hydrogen production methods among the Norwegian public. Energy Res Soc Sci 2023;97:102985. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2023.102985. [B483]

Bharadwaj B, Kambo A, Witt K, Wade B, Weder F, Ashworth P. Shorter message, stronger framing increases societal acceptance for hydrogen. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2024;59:880–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2024.02.024. [B9771]

Bidwell D, Smythe T, Tyler G. Anglers' support for an offshore wind farm: fishing effects or clean energy symbolism. Mar Policy 2023;151:105568. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2023.105568. [B6494]

Bidwell D. Ocean beliefs and support for an offshore wind energy project. Ocean Coast Manag 2017;146:99–108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2017.06.012. [B6320]

Bidwell D. Tourists are people too: nonresidents' values, beliefs, and acceptance of a nearshore wind farm. Energy Policy 2023;173:113365. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2022.113365. [B6495]

Billing SL, Tett P, Charalambides G, Ruzzo C, Arena F, Santoro A, et al. The effects of time and exposure on coastal community opinions on multi-use offshore installations combining fish farms with renewable energy generation. Sustainability 2026;18(2):874. https://doi.org/10.3390/su18020874. [B7509]

Bingaman S, Firestone J, Bidwell D. Winds of change: examining attitude shifts regarding an offshore wind project. J Environ Policy Plan 2022;25(1):55–73. https://doi.org/10.1080/1523908x.2022.2078290. [B6341]

Blöbaum A, Schmidt K, Böcher M, Arlinghaus J, Krause F, Matthies E. Overcoming heuristics that hinder people’s acceptance of climate-change-mitigation technologies. Front Psychol 2025;16:1433280. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1433280. [B4608]

Bolsen T, Palm R, Kingsland JT. Effects of conspiracy rhetoric on views about the consequences of climate change and support for direct carbon capture. Environ Commun 2021;16(2):209–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2021.1991967. [B11027]

Borkowska M, Kabiesz P, Płaza G. From innovation to acceptance: social determinants shaping hydrogen technology development—evidence from Poland. Energies 2026;19:1787. https://doi.org/10.3390/en19071787. [B1743]

Boyd AD, Hmielowski JD, David P. Public perceptions of carbon capture and storage in Canada: results of a national survey. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2017;67:1–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2017.10.010. [B2316]

Boyd AD, Liu Y, Stephens JC, Wilson EJ, Pollak M, Peterson TR, et al. Controversy in technology innovation: contrasting media and expert risk perceptions of the alleged leakage at the Weyburn carbon dioxide storage demonstration project. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2013;14:259–69. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2013.01.011. [B2672]

Boyd AD. Examining community perceptions of energy systems development: the role of communication and sense of place. Environ Commun 2015;11(2):184–204. https://doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2015.1047886. [B2544]

Boyd AD. Risk perceptions of an alleged CO2 leak at a carbon sequestration site. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2016;50:231–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2016.03.025. [B13659]

Braun C, Merk C, Pönitzsch G, Rehdanz K, Schmidt U. Public perception of climate engineering and carbon capture and storage in Germany: survey evidence. Clim Policy 2017;18(4):471–84. https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2017.1304888. [B2278]

Braun C. Not in my backyard: CCS sites and public perception of CCS. Risk Anal 2017;37(12):2264–75. https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.12793. [B2284]

Brennan N, van Rensburg TM. Palm trees, energy security and green hydrogen futures: tourists' views on Mallorca's low carbon transition. Energy Res Soc Sci 2025;120:103923. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2025.103923. [B845]

Brey JJ, Brey R, Carazo AF. Eliciting preferences on the design of hydrogen refueling infrastructure. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2017;42(19):13382–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2017.02.135. [B448]

Broecks K, Jack C, ter Mors E, Boomsma C, Shackley S. How do people perceive carbon capture and storage for industrial processes? Examining factors underlying public opinion in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. Energy Res Soc Sci 2021;81:102236. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2021.102236. [B2408]

Broecks KPF, van Egmond S, van Rijnsoever FJ, Verlinde-van den Berg M, Hekkert MP. Persuasiveness, importance and novelty of arguments about carbon capture and storage. Environ Sci Policy 2016;59:58–66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2016.02.004. [B2545]

Brownlee MTJ, Hallo JC, Jodice LW, Moore DD, Powell RB, Wright BA. Place attachment and marine recreationists' attitudes toward offshore wind energy development. J Leis Res 2015;47(2):263–84. https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.2015.11950360. [B6297]

Brunsting S, Mastop J, Kaiser M, Zimmer R, Shackley S, Mabon L, et al. CCS acceptability: social site characterization and advancing awareness at prospective storage sites in Poland and Scotland. Oil Gas Sci Technol 2014;70(4):767–84. https://doi.org/10.2516/ogst/2014024. [B2622]

Brutschin E, Baum CM, Fritz L, Low S, Sovacool BK, Riahi K. Drivers and attitudes of public support for technological solutions to climate change in 30 countries. Environ Res Lett 2024;19(11):114098. https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ad7c67. [B2514]

Buah E, Linnanen L, Wu H. Augmenting the communication and engagement toolkit for CO2 capture and storage projects. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2021;107:103269. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2021.103269. [B2827]

Buchmayr A, Van Ootegem L, Dewulf J, Verhofstadt E. Understanding attitudes towards renewable energy technologies and the effect of local experiences. Energies 2021;14(22):7596. https://doi.org/10.3390/en14227596. [B6429]

Buchner J, Menrad K, Decker T. Keep it local and safe: which system of green hydrogen production in Germany is accepted by citizens? Renew Energy 2025;241:122366. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2025.122366. [B795]

Buchner J, Menrad K, Decker T. Keep it local vs. financial benefits: compensation payments through cost savings in renewable energy provision for green hydrogen production in Germany. Energy Policy 2026;215:115330. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2026.115330. [B1341]

Buchner J, Menrad K, Decker T. Public acceptance of green hydrogen production in Germany. Renew Sustain Energy Rev 2025;208:115057. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2024.115057. [B456]

Buure K, Kainiemi L, Levänen J. Uncovering opinions on the unfamiliar: investigating the attitude atmosphere around CCUS through media discourses. J Clean Prod 2024;447:141558. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2024.141558. [B2495]

Byun H, Shin J, Lee CY. Using a discrete choice experiment to predict the penetration possibility of environmentally friendly vehicles. Energy 2018;144:312–21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2017.12.035. [B548]

Böhm G, Doran R, Pfister HR. Laypeople's affective images of energy transition pathways. Front Psychol 2018;9:1904. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01904. [B4102]

Cai X, Hwang YS. Building pre-decisional trust: strategic risk communication and authenticity in the public acceptance of small modular reactors. J Risk Res 2026;29(4):498–516. https://doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2026.2660336. [B102]

Campos I, Brito M, Pfenninger-Lee S, Fazendeiro LM, Luz GP, Lombardi F, et al. Narratives, expectations, and policy criteria for a democratic and socially engaging energy transition. Futures 2024;164:103496. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2024.103496. [B1232]

Caporale D, Sangiorgio V, De Lucia C. Extended reality-based choice experiment to assess the impact of offshore wind turbines in historic center: the case of Manfredonia. J Environ Manage 2024;349:119454. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2023.119454. [B6351]

Carley SR, Krause RM, Warren DC, Rupp JA, Graham JD. Early public impressions of terrestrial carbon capture and storage in a coal-intensive state. Environ Sci Technol 2012;46(13):7086–93. https://doi.org/10.1021/es300698n. [B2596]

Carlotto V, Dueñas A, Ingol-Blanco E, Santa-Cruz S. A multi-criteria approach to the selection of geological storage of CO2 sites in Peru. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2022;114:103600. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2022.103600. [B2675]

Cecchini E, Smith J, Underhill V, Reddy E, Prasad M. Risk communication in carbon capture and storage: diverging perceptions among community members and CCS professionals. IEEE Trans Prof Commun 2026;69(1):23–38. https://doi.org/10.1109/tpc.2026.3658118. [B3642]

Chang HJ, Chen CH. Public perceptions of AI-driven renewable energy: determinants of support for green hydrogen applications. Int J Res Eng Technol Manag 2026;14(2):1–17. https://doi.org/10.56805/ijretm.2026.14.2.01. [B1270]

Chen HS. From values to willingness to pay: assessing Generation Z's support for hydrogen mobility in Taiwan. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2025;171:151223. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2025.151223. [B8273]

Chen TY, Huang DR, Huang AYJ. An empirical study on the public perception and acceptance of hydrogen energy in Taiwan. Int J Green Energy 2016;13(15):1579–84. https://doi.org/10.1080/15435075.2016.1206010. [B450]

Chen ZA, Li Q, Liu LC, Zhang X, Kuang L, Jia L, et al. A large national survey of public perceptions of CCS technology in China. Appl Energy 2015;158:366–77. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2015.08.046. [B2293]

Cherry TL, García JH, Kallbekken S, Torvanger A. The development and deployment of low-carbon energy technologies: the role of economic interests and cultural worldviews on public support. Energy Policy 2014;68:562–6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2014.01.018. [B2637]

Cherryman SJ, King S, Hawkes FR, Dinsdale R, Hawkes DL. An exploratory study of public opinions on the use of hydrogen energy in Wales. Public Underst Sci 2008;17(3):397–410. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963662506068053. [B498]

Cho E, Lee J. Social acceptance of small modular reactor (SMR): evidence from a contingent valuation study in South Korea. Nucl Eng Technol 2025;57:103128. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.net.2024.07.059. [B7]

Cho E, Lee J. Socio-political determinants of public acceptance of green hydrogen. Energy Nexus 2025;18:100403. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nexus.2025.100403. [B758]

Chomać-Pierzecka E. Investment in offshore wind energy in Poland and its impact on public opinion. Energies 2024;17(16):3912. https://doi.org/10.3390/en17163912. [B6333]

Chomać-Pierzecka E. Offshore energy development in Poland—social and economic dimensions. Energies 2024;17(9):2068. https://doi.org/10.3390/en17092068. [B6663]

Clulow Z, Ferguson M, Ashworth P, Reiner D. Comparing public attitudes towards energy technologies in Australia and the UK: the role of political ideology. Glob Environ Change 2021;70:102327. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2021.102327. [B2571]

Cotera RV, Bowyer P, Buntemeyer L. Clearing the air: public sentiment on DACCS in Germany. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2026;153:104639. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2026.104639. [B3154]

Cox E, Bellamy R, Waller L. Public attitudes and emotions toward novel carbon removal methods in alternative sociotechnical scenarios. Environ Res Lett 2024;19(8):084026. https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ad5dd0. [B2689]

Cox E, Pidgeon N, Spence E. But they told us it was safe! Carbon dioxide removal, fracking, and ripple effects in risk perceptions. Risk Anal 2021;42(7):1472–87. https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.13717. [B2342]

Coyle FJ. ‘Best practice’ community dialogue: the promise of a small-scale deliberative engagement around the siting of a carbon dioxide capture and storage (CCS) facility. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2016;45:233–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2015.12.006. [B2485]

Cranmer A, Broughel AE, Ericson J, Goldberg M, Dharni K. Getting to 30 GW by 2030: visual preferences of coastal residents for offshore wind farms on the US East Coast. Energy Policy 2023;173:113366. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2022.113366. [B6425]

Cronin Y, Cummins V, Wolsztynski E. Public perception of offshore wind farms in Ireland. Mar Policy 2021;134:104814. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2021.104814. [B6300]

Cudjoe D, Nketiah E, Obuobi B, Adu-Gyamfi G. Towards sustainable renewable energy: assessing residents' willingness to pay for energy from food waste source hydrogen in China. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2025;175:151464. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2025.151464. [B1478]

Dallo I, Marti M, Kuratle LD, Ly C, Zeller S, Zaugg S. Social perspectives of carbon capture, transportation, utilization, and storage in Switzerland. Energy Res Soc Sci 2024;114:103588. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2024.103588. [B2817]

Dalton T, Weir M, Calianos A, D'Aversa N, Livermore J. Recreational boaters' preferences for boating trips associated with offshore wind farms in US waters. Mar Policy 2020;122:104216. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2020.104216. [B6447]

de Best-Waldhober M, Brunsting S, Paukovic M. Public concepts of CCS: understanding of the Dutch general public and its reflection in the media. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2012;11:S139–47. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2012.08.016. [B15430]

de Best-Waldhober M, Daamen D, Faaij A. Informed and uninformed public opinions on CO2 capture and storage technologies in the Netherlands. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2009;3(3):322–32. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2008.09.001. [B2260]

de Best-Waldhober M, Daamen D, Ramirez AR, Faaij A, Hendriks C, de Visser E. Informed public opinion in the Netherlands: evaluation of CO2 capture and storage technologies in comparison with other CO2 mitigation options. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2012;10:169–80. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2012.05.023. [B2427]

De Keyser E, Lijesen MG. Heterogeneous consumer preferences for carbon neutral electricity generation. Energy Rep 2023;9:3473–81. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egyr.2023.02.034. [B3894]

De Medeiros Raposo LCMM. The seascape as an actor in the public acceptance of offshore wind farms. plaNext 2025;16. https://doi.org/10.24306/plnxt/117. [B6731]

de Vries G, Terwel BW, Ellemers N. Perceptions of manipulation and judgments of illegitimacy: pitfalls in the use of emphasis framing when communicating about CO2 capture and storage. Environ Commun 2015;10(2):206–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2015.1047884. [B2573]

Deng C, Dai C. Harmony, risk, and trust: public acceptance of CCUS projects in Guizhou Province, China from a Daoist ecological perspective. J Daoist Stud 2026;19(1s):43–63. [no DOI] [B7631]

Derempouka E, Skjold T, Haarstad H, Njå O, Tvinnereim E. Climate worry, higher education, or both? Exploring the motivations behind hydrogen optimism in Norway. Energy Res Soc Sci 2025;127:104203. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2025.104203. [B1721]

Desvallées L, Arnauld de Sartre X. In the shadow of nuclear dependency: competing pathways and the social acceptance of offshore wind energy in France. Energy Res Soc Sci 2023;98:103029. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2023.103029. [B6388]

Devine-Wright P, Howes Y. Disruption to place attachment and the protection of restorative environments: a wind energy case study. J Environ Psychol 2010;30(3):271–80. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2010.01.008. [B6334]

Devine-Wright P, Wiersma B. Understanding community acceptance of a potential offshore wind energy project in different locations: an island-based analysis of 'place-technology fit'. Energy Policy 2020;137:111086. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2019.111086. [B6304]

Dhingra S, Sharma S, Jaiswal A, Chadha R, Suneja G, Gupta A. Can hydrogen fuel cell vehicles drive the future of sustainable transportation? An empirical study. Technol Sustain 2025;4(2):181–93. https://doi.org/10.1108/techs-01-2025-0007. [B883]

Diamond E, Damato N, Bidwell D, Smythe T. Framing the wind: media coverage of offshore wind in the northeastern United States. Environ Commun 2024;19(2):161–78. https://doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2024.2374927. [B6519]

Djerbi D. Countercurrents to the green energy transition: contested development, procedural injustice, and sovereignty struggles in Tunisia’s green hydrogen contention. J Labor Soc 2025:1–54. https://doi.org/10.1163/24714607-bja10194. [B1119]

Donnison CL, Trdlicova K, Mohr A, Taylor G. A net-zero storyline for success? News media analysis of the social legitimacy of bioenergy with carbon capture and storage in the United Kingdom. Energy Res Soc Sci 2023;102:103153. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2023.103153. [B2717]

Dowd AM, Itaoka K, Ashworth P, Saito A, de Best-Waldhober M. Investigating the link between knowledge and perception of CO2 and CCS: an international study. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2014;28:79–87. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2014.06.009. [B2362]

Drożdż W, Elżanowski F, Dowejko J, Brożyński B. Hydrogen technology on the Polish electromobility market. Legal, economic, and social aspects. Energies 2021;14(9):2357. https://doi.org/10.3390/en14092357. [B11822]

Duan H. The public perspective of carbon capture and storage for CO2 emission reductions in China. Energy Policy 2010;38(9):5281–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2010.05.040. [B2400]

Dubois A, Bates A, Lin A, Schoefs F, Mahieu PA. Transatlantic coastal community voices on floating offshore wind farms with artificial reefs. Wind Energy 2025;28(6):e70021. https://doi.org/10.1002/we.70021. [B6501]

Dubois A, Mahieu PA, Bates A, Meredith J, Schoefs F. Preference and willingness-to-pay analysis for an eco-engineering technology for floating wind turbines. Wind Energy Sci 2026;11(4):1505–29. https://doi.org/10.5194/wes-11-1505-2026. [B6693]

Dumbrell NP, Wheeler SA, Zuo A, Adamson D. Public willingness to make trade-offs in the development of a hydrogen industry in Australia. Energy Policy 2022;165:112987. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2022.112987. [B1205]

Dwyer J, Bidwell D. Chains of trust: energy justice, public engagement, and the first offshore wind farm in the United States. Energy Res Soc Sci 2019;47:166–76. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2018.08.019. [B6317]

Dörpmund F, Reiner D, Pongratz J, Fuss S. Learning increases both acceptability and scrutiny of carbon dioxide removal methods: quasi-experimental evidence. Environ Res Lett 2025;20(11):114009. https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ae0b93. [B3729]

Dütschke E, Wohlfarth K, Höller S, Viebahn P, Schumann D, Pietzner K. Differences in the public perception of CCS in Germany depending on CO2 source, transport option and storage location. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2016;53:149–59. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2016.07.043. [B2370]

Einsiedel EF, Boyd AD, Medlock J, Ashworth P. Assessing socio-technical mindsets: public deliberations on carbon capture and storage in the context of energy sources and climate change. Energy Policy 2013;53:149–58. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2012.10.042. [B2562]

Ellis G, Barry J, Robinson C. Many ways to say 'no', different ways to say 'yes': applying Q-methodology to understand public acceptance of wind farm proposals. J Environ Plan Manag 2007;50(4):517–51. https://doi.org/10.1080/09640560701402075. [B6315]

Emmerich P, Hülemeier AG, Jendryczko D, Baumann MJ, Weil M, Baur D. Public acceptance of emerging energy technologies in context of the German energy transition. Energy Policy 2020;142:111516. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2020.111516. [B658]

Engelmann L, Arning K, Linzenich A, Ziefle M. Risk assessment regarding perceived toxicity and acceptance of carbon dioxide-based fuel by laypeople for its use in road traffic and aviation. Front Energy Res 2020;8:579814. https://doi.org/10.3389/fenrg.2020.579814. [B12029]

Engelmann L, Arning K, Ziefle M. One step closer: laypeople’s perception of production steps for manufacturing CO2-based jet fuel. Energy Sustain Soc 2024;14:9. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13705-024-00441-8. [B2787]

Engelmann L, Haverkämper I, Wilkowska W, Ziefle M. Perceived benefits and barriers of direct air carbon capture and storage: applying a holistic perspective among German citizens using structural equation modeling. Energy Res Soc Sci 2025;127:104270. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2025.104270. [B3201]

Engelmann L, Offermann J, Ziefle M. Public discourse on CO2 transformation technologies: lessons from a German study. Energy Rep 2025;13:5463–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egyr.2025.05.008. [B8271]

Engelmann L, Wilkowska W, Ziefle M. Fresh air or a hard road? Exploring predictors of public acceptance of carbon capture and utilization infrastructure. Fuel Commun 2025;24:100145. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfueco.2025.100145. [B3121]

Etcheguia R, Pascualone MJ. Social perception of green hydrogen production in Patagonia, Argentina. Rev Kawsaypacha Soc Medio Ambiente 2026;(17). https://doi.org/10.18800/kawsaypacha.202601.a009. [B1144]

Falfushynska H, Holz M, Scott C. Comparative socio-economic analysis and green transition perspectives in the green hydrogen economy of Sub-Saharan Africa and South America countries. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2025;176:151543. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2025.151543. [B8151]

Feetham PM, Wright MJ, Carlisle D, Konopka R, Teagle DAH. UK public reaction to carbon dioxide transport and temporary storage at ports. Environ Dev Sustain 2025. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-025-06920-y. [B5426]

Feldpausch-Parker A, Burnham M, Melnik M, Callaghan M, Selfa T. News media analysis of carbon capture and storage and biomass: perceptions and possibilities. Energies 2015;8(4):3058–74. https://doi.org/10.3390/en8043058. [B2324]

Ferguson M, Ashworth P. Message framing, environmental behaviour and support for carbon capture and storage in Australia. Energy Res Soc Sci 2021;73:101931. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2021.101931. [B2761]

Ferguson MD, Evensen D, Ferguson LA, Bidwell D, Firestone J, Dooley TL, et al. Uncharted waters: exploring coastal recreation impacts, coping behaviors, and attitudes towards offshore wind energy development in the United States. Energy Res Soc Sci 2021;75:102029. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2021.102029. [B6356]

Ferguson MD, Powers SL, Trauntvein N, Jacquet JB, Graefe AR, Mowen AJ. Winds of change – predicting water-based recreationists' support and opposition for offshore wind energy development in the Great Lakes. J Great Lakes Res 2019;45(1):187–95. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jglr.2018.10.006. [B6383]

Fikru MG, Nguyen N. Factors shaping public support for more carbon capture and storage projects in the United States. Environ Manage 2024;74(3):425–38. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-024-02000-5. [B2552]

Fikru MG. Policy preference for a net zero carbon economy: results from a US national survey. Energy Policy 2025;198:114479. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2024.114479. [B3986]

Finseraas H, Luckner C. Gender and support for climate change policies: the case of offshore wind farms. Scand Polit Stud 2025;48(4):e70019. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9477.70019. [B6821]

Firestone J, Bates AW, Prefer A. Power transmission: where the offshore wind energy comes home. Environ Innov Soc Transit 2018;29:90–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eist.2018.06.002. [B13123]

Firestone J, Hirt C, Bidwell D, Gardner M, Dwyer J. Faring well in offshore wind power siting? Trust, engagement and process fairness in the United States. Energy Res Soc Sci 2020;62:101393. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2019.101393. [B6337]

Firestone J, Kempton W, Krueger A. Public acceptance of offshore wind power projects in the USA. Wind Energy 2009;12(2):183–202. https://doi.org/10.1002/we.316. [B6274]

Firestone J, Kempton W, Lilley MB, Samoteskul K. Public acceptance of offshore wind power across regions and through time. J Environ Plan Manag 2012;55(10):1369–86. https://doi.org/10.1080/09640568.2012.682782. [B6285]

Firestone J, Kempton W, Lilley MB, Samoteskul K. Public acceptance of offshore wind power: does perceived fairness of process matter? J Environ Plan Manag 2012;55(10):1387–402. https://doi.org/10.1080/09640568.2012.688658. [B6292]

Firestone J, Kempton W. Public opinion about large offshore wind power: underlying factors. Energy Policy 2007;35(3):1584–98. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2006.04.010. [B6270]

Fleishman LA, Bruine de Bruin W, Morgan MG. Informed public preferences for electricity portfolios with CCS and other low-carbon technologies. Risk Anal 2010;30(9):1399–410. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.2010.01436.x. [B2484]

Fleming CS, Gonyo SB, Freitag A, Goedeke TL. Engaged minority or quiet majority? Social intentions and actions related to offshore wind energy development in the United States. Energy Res Soc Sci 2022;84:102440. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2021.102440. [B6489]

Flynn R, Bellaby P, Ricci M. Environmental citizenship and public attitudes to hydrogen energy technologies. Environ Polit 2008;17(5):766–83. https://doi.org/10.1080/09644010802421539. [B524]

Flynn R, Ricci M, Bellaby P. Deliberation over new hydrogen energy technologies: evidence from two Citizens' Panels in the UK. J Risk Res 2013;16(3–4):379–91. https://doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2012.743160. [B697]

Flynn R, Ricci M, Bellaby P. The mirage of citizen engagement in uncertain science: public attitudes towards hydrogen energy. Int J Sci Educ B 2011;1(2):97–114. https://doi.org/10.1080/21548455.2011.585810. [B694]

Fritz L, Baum CM, Brutschin E, Low S, Sovacool BK. Climate beliefs, climate technologies and transformation pathways: contextualizing public perceptions in 22 countries. Glob Environ Change 2024;87:102880. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2024.102880. [B9272]

Frolova M, Pérez-Pérez B, Herrero-Luque D. Diverse responses of coastal communities to offshore wind farming development in Southern Spain. Morav Geogr Rep 2022;30(4):324–39. https://doi.org/10.2478/mgr-2022-0021. [B6504]

Gazzani F. Acceptance of offshore wind farm in Southwest Sardinia in Italy. Do regional energy policies matter? Int J Energy Sect Manag 2024;18(6):2169–90. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijesm-11-2023-0024. [B6439]

Gee K. Offshore wind power development as affected by seascape values on the German North Sea coast. Land Use Policy 2010;27(2):185–94. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2009.05.003. [B6308]

Georgiou I, Areal FJ. Economic valuation of an offshore wind farm in Greece: the role of individual's base-state influences and beliefs in the value formation process. Renew Sustain Energy Rev 2015;52:717–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.07.178. [B6455]

Getor RY, Ramudhin A, Keivanpour S. Social acceptability of a wind turbine blade facility in Kingston upon Hull. J Clean Prod 2022;379:134859. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.134859. [B10938]

Ghimire L, Vitto C, Das T, Waller E, Priest N, Hurlbert M. Public perceptions of low-dose radiation and small modular reactors: a survey-based social science analysis. Energy Strategy Rev 2026;63:102014. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esr.2025.102014. [B43]

Giganti P, Errichiello G, Falcone PM. Exploring public discourse on green hydrogen via YouTube comments: a comparative sentiment analysis using VADER and ChatGPT. Econ Anal Policy 2025;88:2012–30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eap.2025.11.014. [B1070]

Gkeka-Serpetsidaki P, Papadopoulos S, Tsoutsos T. Assessment of the visual impact of offshore wind farms. Renew Energy 2022;190:358–70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2022.03.091. [B6413]

Gkeka-Serpetsidaki P, Tsoutsos T. Integration criteria of offshore wind farms in the landscape: viewpoints of local inhabitants. J Clean Prod 2023;417:137899. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2023.137899. [B9918]

Glover K, Rudd JA, Jones DR, Forde E, Warwick MEA, Gannon WJF, et al. The hydrogen bike: communicating the production and safety of green hydrogen. Front Commun 2021;5:540635. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2020.540635. [B12070]

Gonyo SB, Fleming CS, Freitag A, Goedeke TL. Resident perceptions of local offshore wind energy development: modeling efforts to improve participatory processes. Energy Policy 2021;149:112068. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2020.112068. [B6319]

Gordon JA, Balta-Ozkan N, Haq A, Nabavi SA. Coupling green hydrogen production to community benefits: a pathway to social acceptance? Energy Res Soc Sci 2024;110:103437. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2024.103437. [B445]

Gordon JA, Balta-Ozkan N, Haq A, Nabavi SA. Necessary and sufficient conditions for deploying hydrogen homes: a consumer-oriented perspective. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2024;69:982–1021. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2024.04.352. [B1507]

Gordon JA, Balta-Ozkan N, Haq AU, Nabavi SA. Modelling the innovation-decision process for hydrogen homes: an integrated model of consumer acceptance and adoption intention. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2024;94:554–79. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2024.11.061. [B955]

Gordon JA, Balta-Ozkan N, Nabavi SA. Exploring the contours of consumer heterogeneity: towards a typology of domestic hydrogen acceptance. Energy Res Soc Sci 2024;108:103401. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2023.103401. [B862]

Gordon JA, Balta-Ozkan N, Nabavi SA. Gauging public perceptions of blue and green hydrogen futures: is the twin-track approach compatible with hydrogen acceptance? Int J Hydrogen Energy 2024;49:75–104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2023.06.297. [B471]

Gordon JA, Balta-Ozkan N, Nabavi SA. Hopes and fears for a sustainable energy future: enter the hydrogen acceptance matrix. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2024;60:1170–91. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2024.02.247. [B9833]

Gordon JA, Balta-Ozkan N, Nabavi SA. Price promises, trust deficits and energy justice: public perceptions of hydrogen homes. Renew Sustain Energy Rev 2023;188:113810. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2023.113810. [B9924]

Gough C, Cunningham R, Mander S. Understanding key elements in establishing a social license for CCS: an empirical approach. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2018;68:16–25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2017.11.003. [B2322]

Gough C, O'Keefe L, Mander S. Public perceptions of CO2 transportation in pipelines. Energy Policy 2014;70:106–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2014.03.039. [B2481]

Grover Sharma C. Consumer preferences for alternative fuel vehicles: a discrete choice experiment from New Delhi, India. Indian Growth Dev Rev 2025;18(2–3):178–201. https://doi.org/10.1108/igdr-01-2025-0011. [B1488]

Große-Kreul F, Altstadt L, Reichmann A, Weber N, Witte K. Understanding public acceptance amidst controversy and ignorance: the case of industrial carbon capture and storage in Germany. Energy Res Soc Sci 2024;118:103838. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2024.103838. [B2751]

Guati-Rojo A, Demski C, Poortinga W, Valera-Medina A. Public attitudes and concerns about ammonia as an energy vector. Energies 2021;14:7296. https://doi.org/10.3390/en14217296. [B724]

Gudding P, Kipperberg G, Bond C, Cullen K, Steltzer E. When a good is a bad (or a bad is a good)—analysis of data from an ambiguous nonmarket valuation setting. Sustainability 2018;10(1):208. https://doi.org/10.3390/su10010208. [B6677]

Guo Y, Ashworth P, Sun Y, Yang B, Yang J, Chen J. The influence of narrative versus statistical evidence on public perception towards CCS in China: survey results from local residents in Shandong and Henan provinces. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2019;84:54–61. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2019.02.021. [B2543]

Gyurián Nagy N. Clean but risky: the role of value conflict in consumer adoption of hydrogen mobility. Energies 2026;19:1268. https://doi.org/10.3390/en19051268. [B1946]

Göral E, Hannum CM. The effect of moral framing on attitudes towards offshore wind farms in Turkey. J Behav Exp Econ 2024;110:102189. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2024.102189. [B6420]

Görsch R, Perlaviciute G, Steg L. Temporal stability of public acceptability of novel and established energy technologies. Energy Effic 2025;18:18. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12053-025-10305-5. [B3466]

Ha-Duong M, Nadaï A, Campos AS. A survey on the public perception of CCS in France. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2009;3(5):633–40. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2009.05.003. [B2281]

Haase M, Wulf C, Baumann M, Rösch C, Weil M, Zapp P, et al. Prospective assessment of energy technologies: a comprehensive approach for sustainability assessment. Energy Sustain Soc 2022;12:20. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13705-022-00344-6. [B1191]

Haemmerli L, Stauffacher M. The neglected role of risk mitigation perception in the risk governance of underground technologies—the example of induced seismicity. Int J Disaster Risk Sci 2020;11(5):630–9. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13753-020-00298-3. [B3132]

Han SM, Kim JH, Yoo SH. The public's acceptance toward building a hydrogen fueling station near their residences: the case of South Korea. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2022;47(7):4284–93. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2021.11.106. [B504]

Haraldsson K, Folkesson A, Saxe M, Alvfors P. A first report on the attitude towards hydrogen fuel cell buses in Stockholm. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2006;31(3):317–25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2005.11.008. [B16135]

Hardman S, Chandan A, Shiu E, Steinberger-Wilckens R. Consumer attitudes to fuel cell vehicles post trial in the United Kingdom. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2016;41(15):6171–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2016.02.067. [B446]

Harichandan S, Kar SK, Bansal R, Mishra SK. Achieving sustainable development goals through adoption of hydrogen fuel cell vehicles in India: an empirical analysis. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2023;48(12):4845–59. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2022.11.024. [B467]

Harichandan S, Kar SK. An empirical study on consumer attitude and perception towards adoption of hydrogen fuel cell vehicles in India: policy implications for stakeholders. Energy Policy 2023;178:113587. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2023.113587. [B435]

Harichandan S, Kar SK. An empirical study on motivation to adopt hydrogen fuel cell vehicles in India: policy implications for stakeholders. J Clean Prod 2023;408:137198. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2023.137198. [B588]

Haverkämper I, Wilkowska W, Ziefle M. What makes people accept carbon capture and utilization products? Exploring requirements of use in the German population. Front Energy Res 2023;11:1248555. https://doi.org/10.3389/fenrg.2023.1248555. [B2985]

Heinz B, Erdmann G. Dynamic effects on the acceptance of hydrogen technologies—an international comparison. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2008;33(12):3004–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2008.02.068. [B736]

Heo JY, Yoo SH. The public's value of hydrogen fuel cell buses: a contingent valuation study. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2013;38(11):4232–40. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2013.01.166. [B15029]

Herr DZ, Scovell M, Kinaev N, Vaisman R. Quantifying hydrogen technology acceptance: insights from Bayesian networks. Energy Clim Change 2025;6:100201. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egycc.2025.100201. [B7870]

Hienuki S, Hirayama M, Hirayama Y, Kamada H, Kasai N, Shibutani T, et al. Public acceptance for the implementation of hydrogen self-refueling stations. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2021;46(72):35739–49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2021.08.115. [B425]

Hienuki S, Hirayama Y, Shibutani T, Sakamoto J, Nakayama J, Miyake A. How knowledge about or experience with hydrogen fueling stations improves their public acceptance. Sustainability 2019;11:6339. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11226339. [B466]

Hildebrand J, Kortsch T, Rau I. The public acceptance of power-to-X technologies—results from environmental–psychological research using a representative German sample. Sustainability 2025;17:6574. https://doi.org/10.3390/su17146574. [B914]

Hildebrand J, Sadat-Razavi P, Rau I. Different risks—different views: how hydrogen infrastructure is linked to societal risk perception. Energy Technol 2024;13:2300998. https://doi.org/10.1002/ente.202300998. [B645]

Hlavacek M, Cabelkova I, Pawlak K, Smutka L. Nuclear reactor at home? Public acceptance of small nuclear reactors in the neighborhood. Front Energy Res 2023;11:1211434. https://doi.org/10.3389/fenrg.2023.1211434. [B25]

Hooper T, Hattam C, Austen M. Recreational use of offshore wind farms: experiences and opinions of sea anglers in the UK. Mar Policy 2017;78:55–60. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2017.01.013. [B6373]

Hope ALB, Jones CR. The impact of religious faith on attitudes to environmental issues and carbon capture and storage (CCS) technologies: a mixed methods study. Technol Soc 2014;38:48–59. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2014.02.003. [B2259]

Howell R, Shackley S, Mabon L, Ashworth P, Jeanneret T. Engaging the public with low-carbon energy technologies: results from a Scottish large group process. Energy Policy 2014;66:496–506. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2013.11.041. [B3242]

Huan N, Wang J, Yamamoto T, Hao H, Zhao H, Yao E. Vehicle energy type preferences with hydrogen fuel cell vehicles as an alternative in electrified mobility. Transp Res Part D Transp Environ 2026;159:105500. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2026.105500. [B7141]

Huan N, Yamamoto T, Sato H, Sala R, Goncalves L. Perceptions to connections: a multidimensional investigation of hydrogen acceptance. Renew Sustain Energy Rev 2024;200:114612. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2024.114612. [B535]

Huan N, Yamamoto T, Sato H, Sala R, Tzioutzios D, Goncalves L, et al. Cross-national examination of facilitators and hindrances to the public acceptance of hydrogen refuelling facilities. Sustain Cities Soc 2024;113:105653. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2024.105653. [B543]

Huan N, Yamamoto T, Sato H, Tzioutzios D, Sala R, Goncalves L, et al. Risk perception of hydrogen refuelling infrastructure among local residents and the general public. Sustain Cities Soc 2025;128:106482. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2025.106482. [B542]

Huan N, Yamamoto T, Sato H, Tzioutzios D, Sala R, Goncalves L, et al. Value perceptions outweigh contextual orientations in local support for hydrogen infrastructure. Commun Earth Environ 2025;7:10. https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247-025-03029-y. [B792]

Huan N, Yamamoto T, Sato H, Tzioutzios D, Yin H, Sala R. Does accident awareness affect people's risk perception of hydrogen infrastructure and information-seeking behaviour? Appl Energy 2024;364:123141. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2024.123141. [B605]

Huan N, Yamamoto T, Sato H, Yin H, Tzioutzios D, Goncalves L, et al. Public readiness for hydrogen infrastructure in community settings: comparative evidence on attitudinal dynamics. Cities 2026;169:106600. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2025.106600. [B982]

Huang W, Min H. Social license for the hydrogen economy: evidence from a choice-based conjoint study on public acceptance. Energy 2025;335:137968. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2025.137968. [B747]

Huijts NMA, De Groot JIM, Molin EJE, van Wee B. Intention to act towards a local hydrogen refueling facility: moral considerations versus self-interest. Transp Res Part A Policy Pract 2013;48:63–74. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2012.10.006. [B459]

Huijts NMA, de Vries G, Molin EJE. A positive shift in the public acceptability of a low-carbon energy project after implementation: the case of a hydrogen fuel station. Sustainability 2019;11:2220. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11082220. [B534]

Huijts NMA, Midden CJH, Meijnders AL. Social acceptance of carbon dioxide storage. Energy Policy 2007;35(5):2780–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2006.12.007. [B2325]

Huijts NMA, Molin EJE, van Wee B. Hydrogen fuel station acceptance: a structural equation model based on the technology acceptance framework. J Environ Psychol 2014;38:153–66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2014.01.008. [B422]

Huijts NMA, van Wee B. The evaluation of hydrogen fuel stations by citizens: the interrelated effects of socio-demographic, spatial and psychological variables. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2015;40(33):10367–81. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2015.06.131. [B512]

Huijts NMA. The emotional dimensions of energy projects: anger, fear, joy and pride about the first hydrogen fuel station in the Netherlands. Energy Res Soc Sci 2018;44:138–45. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2018.04.042. [B566]

Hurlbert M, Das T, Vitto C. Transformative power production futures: citizen jury deliberations in Saskatchewan, Canada. Energy Sustain Soc 2023;13:44. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13705-023-00424-1. [B152]

Hurlbert M, Osazuwa-Peters M, Rayner J, Reiner D, Baranovskiy P. Diverse community energy futures in Saskatchewan, Canada. Clean Technol Environ Policy 2020;22(5):1157–72. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10098-020-01859-2. [B155]

Hurlbert M, Osazuwa-Peters M. Carbon capture and storage in Saskatchewan: an analysis of communicative practices in a contested technology. Renew Sustain Energy Rev 2023;173:113104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2022.113104. [B2585]

Hurlbert M, Shasko L, Condor J, Landrie-Parker D. Radiation workers and risk perceptions: low dose radiation, nuclear power production, and small modular nuclear reactors. J Nucl Eng 2023;4(1):258–77. https://doi.org/10.3390/jne4010020 [C170]

Hwang TJ, Kim JY, Yoo SH. Exploring the external benefits of power-to-gas: evidence of a discrete choice experiment in South Korea. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2026;205:153359. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2025.153359. [B1300]

Hydrogen energy as a catalyst for sustainable development: a comparative analysis of policies, strategies, and implementation in Poland and Germany. Sci Pap Silesian Univ Technol Organ Manag Ser 2023;(179). https://doi.org/10.29119/1641-3466.2023.179.37. [B1031]

Hynek N, Gavurova B, Moravec V, Kubak M. Nature-based and geo-engineering climate mitigation technologies: public acceptance and security prospects. iScience 2025;28(5):112303. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isci.2025.112303. [B3469]

Hyun MK, Jin SJ, Yoo SH. Evaluating a floating offshore wind farm: households' willingness to pay in South Korea. Ocean Coast Manag 2024;255:107248. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2024.107248. [B6343]

Hyun MK, Kwak SY, Yoo SH. Public acceptance towards expanding hydrogen fuel cell heavy-duty trucks in South Korea: a monetary assessment based on willingness to pay. Transp Policy 2025;174:103831. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2025.103831. [B7924]

Häußermann JJ, Maier MJ, Kirsch TC, Kaiser S, Schraudner M. Social acceptance of green hydrogen in Germany: building trust through responsible innovation. Energy Sustain Soc 2023;13:22. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13705-023-00394-4. [B516]

Iacob I, Morgan MG. Public perceptions of hydrogen hubs in Southwestern Pennsylvania. J Risk Res 2023;26(11):1283–98. https://doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2023.2287999. [B834]

Ingaldi M, Klimecka-Tatar D. People’s attitude to energy from hydrogen—from the point of view of modern energy technologies and social responsibility. Energies 2020;13:6495. https://doi.org/10.3390/en13246495. [B599]

Iribarren D, Martín-Gamboa M, Manzano J, Dufour J. Assessing the social acceptance of hydrogen for transportation in Spain: an unintentional focus on target population for a potential hydrogen economy. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2016;41(10):5203–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2016.01.139. [B507]

Itaoka K, Saito A, Sasaki K. Public perception on hydrogen infrastructure in Japan: influence of rollout of commercial fuel cell vehicles. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2017;42(11):7290–6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2016.10.123. [B403]

Iwata K, Kyoi S, Ushifusa Y. Public attitudes of offshore wind energy in Japan: an empirical study using choice experiments. Clean Energy Syst 2023;4:100052. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cles.2023.100052. [B6298]

Jaca Madariaga M, Zarrabeitia Bilbao E, Rio Belver RM, Moens MF. Green hydrogen: a social media intelligence analysis. DYNA 2024;99(3):250–5. https://doi.org/10.6036/11069. [B1458]

Javed MS, Fossheim K, Roithner M, Guzik MN, Price J, Seibt B, et al. Preferences of young people reshape modeled national energy system designs toward offshore wind. Commun Sustain 2026;1(1):85. https://doi.org/10.1038/s44458-026-00094-y. [B6879]

Jobin M, Siegrist M. Support for the deployment of climate engineering: a comparison of ten different technologies. Risk Anal 2020;40(5):1058–78. https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.13462. [B3473]

Johansen K. Local support for renewable energy technologies? Attitudes towards local near-shore wind farms among second home owners and permanent area residents on the Danish coast. Energy Policy 2019;132:691–701. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2019.04.027. [B12542]

Jones CR, Olfe-Kräutlein B, Kaklamanou D. Lay perceptions of carbon dioxide utilisation technologies in the United Kingdom and Germany: an exploratory qualitative interview study. Energy Res Soc Sci 2017;34:283–93. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2017.09.011. [B13358]

Jung J, Lee DJ, Yoshida K. Comparison between Korean and Japanese consumers’ preferences for fuel cell electric vehicles. Transp Res Part D Transp Environ 2022;113:103511. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2022.103511. [B1201]

Kaiser C, Patterson J. The changing geographies of renewable energy: accumulation, saturation, and contestation in Dunkirk, France. Appl Geogr 2026;186:103845. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeog.2025.103845. [B7103]

Kang MJ, Park H. Impact of experience on government policy toward acceptance of hydrogen fuel cell vehicles in Korea. Energy Policy 2011;39(6):3465–75. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2011.03.045. [B464]

Kar SK, Bansal R, Harichandan S. An empirical study on intention to use hydrogen fuel cell vehicles in India. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2022;47(46):19999–20015. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2022.04.137. [B514]

Karimi F, Toikka A, Hukkinen JI. Comparative socio-cultural analysis of risk perception of carbon capture and storage in the European Union. Energy Res Soc Sci 2016;21:114–22. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2016.06.024. [B2388]

Karimi F, Toikka A. General public reactions to carbon capture and storage: does culture matter? Int J Greenh Gas Control 2018;70:193–201. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2018.01.012. [B2523]

Karlstrøm H, Ryghaug M. Public attitudes towards renewable energy technologies in Norway. The role of party preferences. Energy Policy 2014;67:656–63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2013.11.049. [B2387]

Kashintseva V, Strielkowski W, Streimikis J, Veynbender T. Consumer attitudes towards industrial CO2 capture and storage products and technologies. Energies 2018;11(10):2787. https://doi.org/10.3390/en11102787. [B2352]

Kato T, Kajitani M, Ushifusa Y. User preferences among households in hydrogen electricity storage using photovoltaic panels. Electr J 2023;36(5):107286. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tej.2023.107286. [B10521]

Kauschke L, Vogt J. Increasing public acceptance of fuel cell vehicles in Germany: a perspective on pioneer users. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2025;148:149726. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2025.05.356. [B1256]

Keeley AR, Koo K, Chapman A, Managi S. Psychological and socio-economic drivers of public acceptance for direct air capture and utilization technology. J Clean Prod 2025;519:145962. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2025.145962. [B2781]

Kempton W, Firestone J, Lilley J, Rouleau T, Whitaker P. The offshore wind power debate: views from Cape Cod. Coast Manag 2005;33(2):119–49. https://doi.org/10.1080/08920750590917530. [B6286]

Kermagoret C, Levrel H, Carlier A, Ponsero A. Stakeholder perceptions of offshore wind power: a fuzzy cognitive mapping approach. Soc Nat Resour 2016;29(8):916–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920.2015.1122134. [B6318]

Khan U, Yamamoto T, Sato H. Consumer preferences for hydrogen fuel cell vehicles in Japan. Transp Res Part D Transp Environ 2020;87:102542. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2020.102542. [B494]

Khan U, Yamamoto T, Sato H. Understanding attitudes of hydrogen fuel-cell vehicle adopters in Japan. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2021;46(60):30698–717. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2021.06.195. [B424]

Kim HJ, Kim JH, Yoo SH. Social acceptance of offshore wind energy development in South Korea: results from a choice experiment survey. Renew Sustain Energy Rev 2019;113:109253. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2019.109253. [B6287]

Kim J, Ladenburg J. Public demand for carbon capture and storage varies with information, development magnitude and prior familiarity. Commun Earth Environ 2024;5:739. https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247-024-01900-y. [B2969]

Kim J, Lee HJ, Huh SY, Yoo SH. Households' willingness to pay for developing marine bio-hydrogen technology: the case of South Korea. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2019;44(26):12907–17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2019.03.202. [B705]

Kim JH, Choi KR, Yoo SH. Evaluating the South Korean public perceptions and acceptance of offshore wind farming: evidence from a choice experiment study. Appl Econ 2021;53(33):3889–99. https://doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2021.1888862. [B6305]

Kim JH, Han SM, Yoo SH. Price premium for green hydrogen in South Korea: evidence from a stated preference study. Renew Energy 2023;211:647–55. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2023.05.035. [B810]

Kim JH, Kim HJ, Yoo SH. Willingness to pay for fuel-cell electric vehicles in South Korea. Energy 2019;174:497–502. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2019.02.185. [B518]

Kim JH, Nam J, Yoo SH. Public acceptance of a large-scale offshore wind power project in South Korea. Mar Policy 2020;120:104141. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2020.104141. [B6335]

Kim JK, Kim JH, Yoo SH. Public willingness to pay for introducing a sector-coupling system for power-to-gas in South Korea. J Energy Eng 2024;33(1):108–21. https://doi.org/10.5855/energy.2024.33.1.108. [B1261]

Kim K, Moon S, Kim J. How far is it from your home? Strategic policy and management to overcome barriers of introducing fuel-cell power generation facilities. Energy Policy 2023;182:113746. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2023.113746. [B10030]

Kim K, Moon S, Lee J, Kim J. Environmental impacts of transportation policy and vehicle market share predictions. Transp Res Part D Transp Environ 2023;114:103550. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2022.103550. [B10367]

Kim KJ, Bae JH, Yoo SH. The public preferences for coal-to-nuclear: a contingent valuation experiment in South Korea. Prog Nucl Energy 2026;199:106485. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pnucene.2026.106485. [B147]

Kim S, Kim J, Kim H. Perception, intimacy, risk, and fear: assessing the impact on the adoption of HFCVs and hydrogen energy. Int J Sustain Transp 2025:1–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/15568318.2025.2557334. [B1253]

Kim SG, Kim HS, Won JS. Assessing accessibility and public acceptance of hydrogen refueling stations in Seoul, South Korea: a network-based location-allocation framework for sustainable urban hydrogen mobility. Sustainability 2026;18:4227. https://doi.org/10.3390/su18094227. [B1065]

Kim W, Kim J, Jang JA, Kim SH. Do perceptions of hydrogen energy effect on vehicle preference? A learning-based model approach. KSCE J Civ Eng 2023;27(2):805–13. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12205-022-0227-x. [B666]

Kim Y, Kim JH, Yoo SH. South Koreans' acceptance of hydrogen production using nuclear energy. Int J Energy Res 2021;46(4):5350–61. https://doi.org/10.1002/er.7465. [B657]

Kiviluoma N, Savela N, Kojo M. Exploring gender insights on the perceived safety and acceptability of small modular reactors. Energy Strategy Rev 2025;62:101882. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esr.2025.101882. [B7928]

Klain S, Satterfield T, Chan KMA, Lindberg K. Octopus's garden under the blade: boosting biodiversity increases willingness to pay for offshore wind in the United States. Energy Res Soc Sci 2020;69:101744. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2020.101744. [B6313]

Klain SC, Satterfield T, Sinner J, Ellis JI, Chan KMA. Bird killer, industrial intruder or clean energy? Perceiving risks to ecosystem services due to an offshore wind farm. Ecol Econ 2018;143:111–29. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2017.06.030. [B6378]

Klaus G, Ernst A, Oswald L. Psychological factors influencing laypersons’ acceptance of climate engineering, climate change mitigation and business as usual scenarios. Technol Soc 2020;60:101222. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2019.101222. [B2847]

Klocker N, Carr C, Fulton E, Larkin N. “Might give some hope for the future”: understanding young adults' support for offshore wind in coastal Australia. Energy Res Soc Sci 2026;134:104610. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2026.104610. [B6886]

Ko S, Shin J. Projection of fuel cell electric vehicle demand reflecting the feedback effects between market conditions and market share affected by spatial factors. Energy Policy 2023;173:113385. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2022.113385. [B885]

Kojo M, Innola E. Carbon capture and storage in the Finnish print media. Risk Hazards Crisis Public Policy 2017;8(2):113–46. https://doi.org/10.1002/rhc3.12111. [B2768]

Komatsu H, Kubota H, Asano K, Nagai Y. Effect of information provision by familial nudging on attitudes toward offshore wind power. PLoS One 2024;19(1):e0297199. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0297199. [B6534]

Kontogianni A, Tourkolias C, Papageorgiou EI. Revealing market adaptation to a low carbon transport economy: tales of hydrogen futures as perceived by fuzzy cognitive mapping. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2013;38(2):709–22. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2012.10.101. [B14878]

Koot C, ter Mors E, Ellemers N, Daamen DDL. Facilitation of attitude formation through communication: how perceived source expertise enhances the ability to achieve cognitive closure about complex environmental topics. J Appl Soc Psychol 2016;46(11):627–40. https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12391. [B3208]

Korchy H, Mishima N. Exploring the social acceptance of offshore wind farms in Morocco. Sustainability 2026;18(9):4347. https://doi.org/10.3390/su18094347 [C192]

Kormos C, Axsen J, Long Z, Goldberg S. Latent demand for zero-emissions vehicles in Canada (Part 2): insights from a stated choice experiment. Transp Res Part D Transp Environ 2019;67:685–702. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2018.10.010. [B632]

Koukouzas N, Christopoulou M, Giannakopoulou PP, Rogkala A, Gianni E, Karkalis C, et al. Current CO2 capture and storage trends in Europe in a view of social knowledge and acceptance. A short review. Energies 2022;15(15):5716. https://doi.org/10.3390/en15155716. [B2461]

Kozhikov M, Janelidze P, Seitmukhanbet A, Aiman Y, Karymsakov A, Mkilima T. Community-centric carbon reduction initiatives and their impact on grid emission factors: a case study in Kazakhstan. Pol J Environ Stud 2024;33(4):3721–31. https://doi.org/10.15244/pjoes/178314. [B4941]

Kraeusel J, Möst D. Carbon capture and storage on its way to large-scale deployment: social acceptance and willingness to pay in Germany. Energy Policy 2012;49:642–51. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2012.07.006. [B2269]

Krause RM, Carley SR, Warren DC, Rupp JA, Graham JD. “Not in (or under) my backyard”: geographic proximity and public acceptance of carbon capture and storage facilities. Risk Anal 2013;34(3):529–40. https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.12119. [B2288]

Kwak K, Woo J, Ahn J. Analyzing community acceptance of hydrogen refueling station in South Korea: discrete choice experiment approach. Innov Stud 2024;19(3):157–81. https://doi.org/10.46251/innos.2024.8.19.3.157. [B563]

Ladenburg J, Dubgaard A. Preferences of coastal zone user groups regarding the siting of offshore wind farms. Ocean Coast Manag 2009;52(5):233–42. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2009.02.002. [B6321]

Ladenburg J, Dubgaard A. Willingness to pay for reduced visual disamenities from offshore wind farms in Denmark. Energy Policy 2007;35(8):4059–71. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2007.01.023. [B6271]

Ladenburg J, Dávila JG. Household willingness to pay for CCS-based low-carbon cement. Energy Build 2026;363:117570. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2026.117570. [B3651]

Ladenburg J, Hevia-Koch P, Petrović S, Knapp L. The offshore-onshore conundrum: preferences for wind energy considering spatial data in Denmark. Renew Sustain Energy Rev 2020;121:109711. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2020.109711. [B6673]

Ladenburg J, Kim J, Zuch M, Soytas U. Taking the carbon capture and storage, wind power, PV or other renewable technology path to fight climate change? Exploring the acceptance of climate change mitigation technologies – a Danish national representative study. Renew Energy 2024;220:119582. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2023.119582. [B2629]

Ladenburg J, Knapp LA, Petrovic S. Distance to offshore wind farms, onshore wind power spillover relationships, and the willingness to pay for farshore, large-scale wind power development. Appl Econ 2024;57(46):7402–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2024.2392051. [B6466]

Ladenburg J, Möller B. Attitude and acceptance of offshore wind farms—the influence of travel time and wind farm attributes. Renew Sustain Energy Rev 2011;15(9):4223–35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2011.07.130. [B6281]

Ladenburg J, Skotte M. Heterogeneity in willingness to pay for the location of offshore wind power development: an application of the willingness to pay space model. Energy 2022;241:122900. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2021.122900. [B6303]

Ladenburg J, Zuch M, Kim J. Can acceptance of location-specific carbon capture and storage be tipped? The causal effects of information and question framing. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2026;150:104566. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2026.104566. [B3057]

Ladenburg J. Attitudes towards offshore wind farms—the role of beach visits on attitude and demographic and attitude relations. Energy Policy 2010;38(3):1297–304. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2009.11.005. [B6273]

Ladenburg J. Attitudes towards on-land and offshore wind power development in Denmark; choice of development strategy. Renew Energy 2008;33(1):111–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2007.01.011. [B6276]

Ladenburg J. Does more wind energy influence the choice of location for wind power development? Assessing the cumulative effects of daily wind turbine encounters in Denmark. Energy Res Soc Sci 2015;10:26–30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2015.06.005. [B6670]

Ladenburg J. Testing the correlation between prior knowledge of - and visualisation guided WTPs for reducing the visual impacts visual from offshore wind farms. J Energy Power Technol 2020;2(3):1–18. https://doi.org/10.21926/jept.2003015. [B6654]

Ladenburg J. Visual impact assessment of offshore wind farms and prior experience. Appl Energy 2009;86(3):380–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2008.05.005. [B6289]

Lamy J, Bruine de Bruin W, Azevedo IML, Morgan MG. Keep wind projects close? A case study of distance, culture, and cost in offshore and onshore wind energy siting. Energy Res Soc Sci 2020;63:101377. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2019.101377. [B12342]

Lashari ZA, Ko J, Jung S, Choi S. Choices of potential car buyers regarding alternative fuel vehicles in South Korea: a discrete choice modeling approach. Sustainability 2022;14:5360. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14095360. [B1293]

Latif RMA. Enhancing sustainable urban mobility in Pakistan through renewable hydrogen integration and policy interventions. Discov Cities 2025;2:44. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44327-025-00089-9. [B866]

Lee CY, Perlaviciute G, Steg L. Forest or machine? Public perceptions and acceptability of negative emissions technologies and practices across six European countries. Clim Change 2025;178:188. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-025-04043-x. [B2674]

Lee J, Cho E. A techno-economic analysis on reactive capture and conversion using contingent valuation method. Energy Storage 2025;7:e70144. https://doi.org/10.1002/est2.70144. [B3051]

Lee JS, Choi EC. CO2 leakage environmental damage cost – a CCS project in South Korea. Renew Sustain Energy Rev 2018;93:753–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2018.04.074. [B2652]

Lee MK, Nam J, Kim M. Valuing the public preference for offshore wind energy: the case study in South Korea. Energy 2023;263:125827. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2022.125827. [B6423]

Lee S, Choi I. Analysis of group perception differences on the acceptability of offshore wind project. J Fish Mar Sci Educ 2024;36(2):362–73. https://doi.org/10.13000/jfmse.2024.4.36.2.362. [B6682]

Li Q, Liu G, Cai B, Leamon G, Liu LC, Chen ZA, et al. Public awareness of the environmental impact and management of carbon dioxide capture, utilization and storage technology: the views of educated people in China. Clean Technol Environ Policy 2017;19(8):2041–56. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10098-017-1387-0. [B2442]

Li W, Long R, Chen H, Chen F, Zheng X, He Z, et al. Willingness to pay for hydrogen fuel cell electric vehicles in China: a choice experiment analysis. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2020;45(59):34346–53. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2020.01.046. [B439]

Li W, Yamamoto T, Zhu Y, Guan H, Zhang Q. A dual-process cognitive framework for analyzing public adoption of hydrogen fuel cell vehicles: a case study in Beijing, China. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2025;185:151957. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2025.151957. [B1066]

Liao VTC. Marine spatial planning identifies solutions for offshore wind farms at fishery and environment in Taiwan territorial waters. Energy Environ 2023;36(3):1247–70. https://doi.org/10.1177/0958305x231194720. [B6586]

Lilley J, Firestone J. The effect of the 2010 Gulf oil spill on public attitudes toward offshore oil drilling and wind development. Energy Policy 2013;62:90–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2013.07.139. [B6462]

Lima PR, Pereira AAM, Chaves GDLD, Meneguelo AP. Environmental awareness and public perception on carbon capture and storage (CCS) in Brazil. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2021;111:103467. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2021.103467. [B2367]

Lines L, Kuby M, Schultz R, Clancy J, Xie Z. A rental car strategy for commercialization of hydrogen in Florida. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2008;33(20):5312–25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2008.05.102. [B1058]

Linnerud K, Dugstad A, Rygg BJ, Gilpin GS, Holden E. Energy crisis and social acceptance of offshore wind – a before-and-after analysis. Energy 2025;325:136049. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2025.136049. [B6442]

Linnerud K, Dugstad A, Rygg BJ. Do people prefer offshore to onshore wind energy? The role of ownership and intended use. Renew Sustain Energy Rev 2022;168:112732. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2022.112732. [B6613]

Linzenich A, Arning K, Offermann-van Heek J, Ziefle M. Uncovering attitudes towards carbon capture storage and utilization technologies in Germany: insights into affective-cognitive evaluations of benefits and risks. Energy Res Soc Sci 2019;48:205–18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2018.09.017. [B2319]

Linzenich A, Arning K, Ziefle M. Acceptance of energy technologies in context: comparing laypeople's risk perceptions across eight infrastructure technologies in Germany. Energy Policy 2021;152:112071. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2020.112071. [B2429]

Lipman TE, Elke M, Lidicker J. Hydrogen fuel cell electric vehicle performance and user-response assessment: results of an extended driver study. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2018;43(27):12442–54. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2018.04.172. [B1063]

Liu B, Xu Y, Chen Y, Lu S, Zhao D. How to garner public support for carbon capture, utilization and storage? Comparing narrative and statistical frames among Chinese citizens. Energy Res Soc Sci 2022;91:102738. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2022.102738. [B2524]

Liu B, Xu Y, Yang Y, Lu S. How public cognition influences public acceptance of CCUS in China: based on the ABC (affect, behavior, and cognition) model of attitudes. Energy Policy 2021;156:112390. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2021.112390. [B2344]

Liu J, Chen T, Hu B. Consumer acceptance under hydrogen energy promotion policy: evidence from Yangtze River Delta. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2023;48(30):11104–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2022.07.081. [B612]

Liu Y, Li Y, Ye K, Huang X. Consumer preferences for hydrogen fuel cell vehicles adoption: a discrete choice survey. Transp Res Part D Transp Environ 2025;146:104892. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2025.104892. [B826]

Liu Y, Li Z, Huang X, Liu F, Zhou F, Lim MK. Uncovering determinants and barriers to hydrogen fuel cell vehicle adoption: evidence from Chongqing, China. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2025;106:875–87. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2025.02.037. [B764]

Lock SJ, Smallman M, Lee M, Rydin Y. “Nuclear energy sounded wonderful 40 years ago”: UK citizen views on CCS. Energy Policy 2014;66:428–35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2013.11.024. [B2773]

Loengbudnark W, Khalilpour K, Bharathy G, Taghikhah F, Voinov A. Battery and hydrogen-based electric vehicle adoption: a survey of Australian consumers perspective. Case Stud Transp Policy 2022;10(4):2451–63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cstp.2022.11.007. [B1164]

Long Z, Axsen J, Kormos C, Goldberg S. Latent demand for zero-emissions vehicles in Canada (Part 1): insights from a design space exercise. Transp Res Part D Transp Environ 2019;67:51–66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2018.10.009. [B1247]

Loukogeorgaki E, Vagiona DG, Lioliou A. Incorporating public participation in offshore wind farm siting in Greece. Wind 2022;2(1):1–16. https://doi.org/10.3390/wind2010001. [B6486]

Low S, Fritz L, Baum CM, Sovacool BK. Public perceptions on carbon removal from focus groups in 22 countries. Nat Commun 2024;15:3453. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-47853-w. [B2491]

Lozano LL, Bharadwaj B, de Sales A, Kambo A, Ashworth P. Societal acceptance of hydrogen for domestic and export applications in Australia. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2022;47(67):28806–18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2022.06.209. [B661]

Lozanovski A, Whitehouse N, Ko N, Whitehouse S. Sustainability assessment of fuel cell buses in public transport. Sustainability 2018;10:1480. https://doi.org/10.3390/su10051480. [B1115]

Lu S, Fang M, Wang Q, Huang L, Sun W, Zhang Y, et al. Public acceptance investigation for 2 million tons/year flue gas CO2 capture, transportation and oil displacement storage project. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2021;111:103442. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2021.103442. [B2566]

Lutzeyer S, Phaneuf DJ, Taylor LO. The amenity costs of offshore wind farms: evidence from a choice experiment. Energy Econ 2018;72:621–39. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2018.03.020. [B6290]

Lutzke L, Árvai J. Consumer acceptance of products from carbon capture and utilization. Clim Change 2021;166:15. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-021-03110-3. [B2414]

L'Orange Seigo S, Arvai J, Dohle S, Siegrist M. Predictors of risk and benefit perception of carbon capture and storage (CCS) in regions with different stages of deployment. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2014;25:23–32. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2014.03.007. [B2282]

L'Orange Seigo S, Wallquist L, Dohle S, Siegrist M. Communication of CCS monitoring activities may not have a reassuring effect on the public. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2011;5(6):1674–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2011.05.040. [B2628]

Mabon L, Littlecott C. Stakeholder and public perceptions of CO2-EOR in the context of CCS – results from UK focus groups and implications for policy. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2016;49:128–37. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2016.02.031. [B2531]

Mabon L, Shackley S, Blackford JC, Stahl H, Miller A. Local perceptions of the QICS experimental offshore CO2 release: results from social science research. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2015;38:18–25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2014.10.022. [B2684]

Mabon L, Shackley S, Bower-Bir N. Perceptions of sub-seabed carbon dioxide storage in Scotland and implications for policy: a qualitative study. Mar Policy 2014;45:9–15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2013.11.011. [B2474]

Malakar Y, Baum CM, Gardner J, Brent K, Jeanneret T, Fritz L, et al. Beyond environmental identity: testing public support for novel carbon dioxide removal in Australia using structural modelling. J Environ Manage 2025;394:127633. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2025.127633. [B2932]

Martin E, Shaheen SA, Lipman TE, Lidicker JR. Behavioral response to hydrogen fuel cell vehicles and refueling: results of California drive clinics. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2009;34(20):8670–80. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2009.07.098. [B495]

Matsuda dos Santos M, Peterson M, Righetti T, Feldman D. Investigating citizens' support for the emerging innovation of nuclear microreactors. Prog Nucl Energy 2026;196:106356. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pnucene.2026.106356. [B190]

Matthews A, Hmielowski JD. Green morality: exploring the role of elaboration between moral framing and attitudes toward green energy. J Environ Stud Sci 2026. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13412-026-01109-9. [B6901]

Mercer N, Hudson A, Martin D, Parker P. "That's our traditional way as Indigenous peoples": towards a conceptual framework for understanding community support of sustainable energies in NunatuKavut, Labrador. Sustainability 2020;12:6050. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12156050. [B145]

Mercer NMJ. Sustainability: panacea or local energy injustice? A qualitative media review of Newfoundland and Labrador's wind-to-hydrogen boom. Sustainability 2025;17(24):11035. https://doi.org/10.3390/su172411035. [B7883]

Merk C, Klaus G, Pohlers J, Ernst A, Ott K, Rehdanz K. Public perceptions of climate engineering: laypersons' acceptance at different levels of knowledge and intensities of deliberation. GAIA Ecol Perspect Sci Soc 2019;28(4):348–55. https://doi.org/10.14512/gaia.28.4.6. [B2430]

Merk C, Liebe U, Meyerhoff J, Rehdanz K. German citizens' preference for domestic carbon dioxide removal by afforestation is incompatible with national removal potential. Commun Earth Environ 2023;4:100. https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247-023-00713-9. [B2482]

Merk C, Nordø ÅD, Andersen G, Lægreid OM, Tvinnereim E. Don't send us your waste gases: public attitudes toward international carbon dioxide transportation and storage in Europe. Energy Res Soc Sci 2022;87:102450. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2021.102450. [B2500]

Midden CJH, Huijts NMA. The role of trust in the affective evaluation of novel risks: the case of CO2 storage. Risk Anal 2009;29(5):743–51. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.2009.01201.x. [B15475]

Moon S, Kim K, Kim J. A study on public acceptance of hydrogen portfolio standard for renewable energy expansion: comparative analysis of hydrogen production mix plans. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2024;49:538–52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2023.09.224. [B634]

Moon S, Kim K, Seung H, Kim J. Strategic analysis on effects of technologies, government policies, and consumer perceptions on diffusion of hydrogen fuel cell vehicles. Energy Econ 2022;115:106382. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2022.106382. [B530]

Moon S, Kim Y, Kim M, Lee J. Policy designs to increase public and local acceptance for energy transition in South Korea. Energy Policy 2023;182:113736. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2023.113736. [B6541]

Moon S, Lee J, Choi H, Woo J. Impact of energy production mix on alternative fuel vehicle adoption in Korea. Transp Res Part D Transp Environ 2022;105:103219. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2022.103219. [B1216]

Moon WK, Kahlor LA, Olson HC. Understanding public support for carbon capture and storage policy: the roles of social capital, stakeholder perceptions, and perceived risk/benefit of technology. Energy Policy 2020;139:111312. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2020.111312. [B2310]

Mourato S, Saynor B, Hart D. Greening London's black cabs: a study of driver's preferences for fuel cell taxis. Energy Policy 2004;32(5):685–95. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0301-4215(02)00335-x. [B897]

Moutenet JP, Bédard K, Malo M. Public awareness and opinion on CCS in the province of Québec, Canada. Greenh Gases Sci Technol 2012;2(2):126–35. https://doi.org/10.1002/ghg.1278. [B3020]

Mulyasari F, Harahap AK, Rio AO, Sule R, Kadir WGA. Potentials of the public engagement strategy for public acceptance and social license to operate: case study of carbon capture, utilisation, and storage Gundih pilot project in Indonesia. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2021;108:103312. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2021.103312. [B2351]

Nawaz S, Peterson St-Laurent G, Satterfield T. Public evaluations of four approaches to ocean-based carbon dioxide removal. Clim Policy 2023;23(3):379–94. https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2023.2179589. [B2375]

Ndibueze OO. Cross-border CO2 transport decreases public support for carbon capture and storage. Int J Pet Gas Eng Res 2024;7(1):109–16. https://doi.org/10.37745/ijpger.17/vol7n1109116. [B3768]

Netto ALA, Câmara G, Rocha E, Silva AL, Andrade JCS, Peyerl D, et al. A first look at social factors driving CCS perception in Brazil: a case study in the Recôncavo Basin. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2020;98:103053. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2020.103053. [B2534]

Nichifor MA. Public reactions towards wind energy instalments. Case study: Romania and the Netherlands. Manag Mark 2016;11(3):532–43. https://doi.org/10.1515/mmcks-2016-0014. [B13570]

Nie X, Ma H, Chen S, Li K, Yu Z, Wang H, et al. Offshore wind farms and tourism development relationship to energy distribution justice for the Beibu Gulf, China. Land 2024;13(5):678. https://doi.org/10.3390/land13050678. [B6568]

Nie X, Wei X, Xia Q, Zhou M. Customers’ purchase intention for hydrogen vehicle and industrial agglomeration: evidence from Jiangsu Province, China. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2021;46(34):18011–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2020.10.055. [B798]

Novak AN. Global discourses of protest and support of offshore wind energy. Qual Res Rep Commun 2024;26(1):71–83. https://doi.org/10.1080/17459435.2024.2342941. [B6503]

Nuortimo K. Measuring public acceptance with opinion mining: the case of the energy industry with long-term coal research and development investment projects. J Intell Stud Bus 2018;8(2):6–22. https://doi.org/10.37380/jisib.v8i2.319. [B3287]

Nytte S, Alfnes F, Korhonen-Sande S. Public support and opposition toward floating offshore wind power development in Norway. Electr J 2024;37(1):107336. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tej.2023.107336. [B6295]

Nytte S, Navrud S, Alfnes F. Social acceptance of new floating offshore wind power: do attitudes towards existing offshore industries matter? Renew Energy 2024;230:120855. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2024.120855. [B6296]

Nyári J, Toldy ÁI, Järvinen M, Santasalo-Aarnio A. Awareness increases acceptance and willingness to pay for low-carbon fuels amongst marine passengers. Heliyon 2024;10:e24714. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e24714. [B711]

O'Beirne P, Battersby F, Mallett A, Aczel M, Makuch K, Workman M, et al. The UK net-zero target: insights into procedural justice for greenhouse gas removal. Environ Sci Policy 2020;112:264–74. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2020.06.013. [B12246]

Offermann-van Heek J, Arning K, Linzenich A, Ziefle M. Trust and distrust in carbon capture and utilization industry as relevant factors for the acceptance of carbon-based products. Front Energy Res 2018;6:73. https://doi.org/10.3389/fenrg.2018.00073. [B2396]

Offermann-van Heek J, Arning K, Sternberg A, Bardow A, Ziefle M. Assessing public acceptance of the life cycle of CO2-based fuels: does information make the difference? Energy Policy 2020;143:111586. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2020.111586. [B2865]

Oh CO, Nam J, Kim H. The impacts of offshore wind farms on coastal tourists' behaviors in South Korea. Coast Manag 2022;51(1):24–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/08920753.2023.2148848. [B6553]

Oliveira FG, Campos I, Moreira Alves F. A quiet public? Procedural justice in Portuguese wind energy governance. Energy Res Soc Sci 2025;126:104147. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2025.104147. [B6907]

Oltra C, Delicado A, Dütschke E, Gonçalves L, López-Asensio S, Mays C, et al. Articulating conditions for geological carbon storage: conditional acceptance in three European communities. Energy Res Soc Sci 2026;136:104739. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2026.104739. [B3858]

Oltra C, Sala R, Boso À. The influence of information on individuals' reactions to CCS technologies: results from experimental online survey research. Greenh Gases Sci Technol 2012;2(3):209–15. https://doi.org/10.1002/ghg.1285. [B2814]

Oltra C, Sala R, Solà R, Di Masso M, Rowe G. Lay perceptions of carbon capture and storage technology. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2010;4(4):698–706. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2010.02.001. [B2274]

Ono K, Kato E, Tsunemi K. Construction of a structural equation model to identify public acceptance factors for hydrogen refueling stations under the provision of risk and safety information. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2022;47(75):31974–84. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2022.07.139. [B432]

Ono K, Kato E, Tsunemi K. Does risk information change the acceptance of hydrogen refueling stations in the general Japanese population? Int J Hydrogen Energy 2019;44(31):16038–47. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2019.04.257. [B404]

Ono K, Tsunemi K. Identification of public acceptance factors with risk perception scales on hydrogen fueling stations in Japan. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2017;42(16):10697–707. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2017.03.021. [B421]

Osazuwa-Peters M, Hurlbert M, McNutt K, Rayner J, Gamtessa S. Saskatchewan’s energy future: risk and pathways analysis. Environ Innov Soc Transit 2020;34:237–50. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eist.2020.01.010. [B3548]

Osiolo HH, Mukundan S. From promise to legitimacy: a survey-based study of stakeholder engagement and public acceptance of small modular reactors in the UK. Energy Convers Manag X 2026;30:101860. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecmx.2026.101860. [B99]

Ostad Rahimi S, Molder AL, Ter-Mkrtchyan A, Livingston W, León-Corwin M, Bitterman A, et al. Perceived risks, benefits, and support for siting energy infrastructure: comparing perceptions of carbon capture, nuclear fuel, and large-scale energy facilities. J Risk Res 2026:1–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2026.2689344. [B4046]

Ostfeld R, Reiner DM. Public views of Scotland's path to decarbonization: evidence from citizens' juries and focus groups. Energy Policy 2020;140:111332. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2020.111332. [B3636]

O’Garra T, Mourato S, Pearson P. Analysing awareness and acceptability of hydrogen vehicles: a London case study. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2005;30(6):649–59. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2004.10.008. [B451]

O’Garra T, Mourato S, Pearson P. Investigating attitudes to hydrogen refuelling facilities and the social cost to local residents. Energy Policy 2008;36(6):2074–85. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2008.02.026. [B410]

Palanca AG, Chao CLV, Yap KJR, de Leon RL. Bridging the gap: public perception and acceptance of hydrogen technology in the Philippines. Sustainability 2025;17:324. https://doi.org/10.3390/su17010324. [B814]

Palomo-Vélez G, Perlaviciute G, Contzen N, Steg L. How company history and hydrogen type shape public trust and acceptability: a reputation management perspective. Energy Res Soc Sci 2025;127:104279. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2025.104279. [B1088]

Panica D, Niculicea AM, Sorescu D. Heroes, villains, and victims: a narrative policy framework analysis of media discourse on CCUS in Greece, Romania and Denmark. Open Res Eur 2026;6:6. https://doi.org/10.12688/openreseurope.21802.1. [B4755]

Park C, Koo M, Woo J, Hong BI, Shin J. Economic valuation of green hydrogen charging compared to gray hydrogen charging: the case of South Korea. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2022;47(32):14393–403. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2022.02.214. [B593]

Park S, Nam S, Oh M, Choi IJ, Shin J. Preference structure on the design of hydrogen refueling stations to activate energy transition. Energies 2020;13:3959. https://doi.org/10.3390/en13153959. [B416]

Park S, Yun SJ, Cho K. Public dialogue as a collaborative planning process for offshore wind energy projects: implications from a text analysis of a South Korean case. Renew Sustain Energy Rev 2022;169:112949. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2022.112949. [B6567]

Park Y, Park SY, Lee H. Consumers’ acceptance of the explosion, toxicity, and odor potential of ammonia: a survey on consumers’ choice of an ammonia-based hydrogen refueling station. Sustain Energy Technol Assess 2023;58:103374. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seta.2023.103374. [B473]

Parsons G, Firestone J, Yan L, Toussaint J. The effect of offshore wind power projects on recreational beach use on the east coast of the United States: evidence from contingent-behavior data. Energy Policy 2020;144:111659. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2020.111659. [B12302]

Parton LC, Phaneuf DJ, Taylor LO, Lutzeyer S. Bidding against the wind: a choice experiment in green energy, green jobs and offshore views in North Carolina, USA. J Environ Manage 2024;351:119821. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2023.119821. [B6556]

Penneman J, Buchmayr A, Van Ootegem L, Verhofstadt E. The evolution of the pre- and post-construction public opinions toward offshore wind energy on the Belgian coast. J Environ Plan Manag 2022;66(12):2536–55. https://doi.org/10.1080/09640568.2022.2079078. [B6407]

Perdan S, Jones CR, Azapagic A. Public awareness and acceptance of carbon capture and utilisation in the UK. Sustain Prod Consum 2017;10:74–84. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spc.2017.01.001. [B2309]

Peterson M, Enriques S, Godby R, Feldman D. Gauging citizen preferences for the emerging energy-technology of nuclear microreactors. Technol Soc 2025;83:103046. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2025.103046. [B81]

Pianta S, Rinscheid A, Weber EU. Carbon capture and storage in the United States: perceptions, preferences, and lessons for policy. Energy Policy 2021;151:112149. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2021.112149. [B2287]

Pieri T, Nikitas A, Angelis-Dimakis A. Public acceptance and willingness to pay for carbon capture and utilisation products. Clean Technol 2023;5(1):436–50. https://doi.org/10.3390/cleantechnol5010022. [B2379]

Pisarski A, Ashworth P. The Citizen’s Round Table process: canvassing public opinion on energy technologies to mitigate climate change. Clim Change 2013;119(2):533–46. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-013-0709-4. [B3309]

Prades A, Espluga J, Real M, Solá R. The siting of a research centre on clean coal combustion and CO2 capture in Spain: some notes on the relationship between trust and lack of public information. J Risk Res 2009;12(5):709–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/13669870902935460. [B15734]

Przybylowski A, Palewski K, Owczarek T. Hydrogen vehicle adoption: perceptions, barriers, and global strategies. Energies 2025;18:5647. https://doi.org/10.3390/en18215647. [B787]

Pérez-Pérez B, Rodríguez-Segura FJ, Osorio-Aravena JC, Díaz-Cuevas P, Frolova M. Winds of change: surfing prospects for offshore wind energy in coastal Spain (Cádiz). Renew Sustain Energy Rev 2026;226:116451. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2025.116451. [B6600]

Raimi KT, Wolske KS, Hart PS, Choi S. Exploring public perceptions of carbon capture and utilization in the U.S. Sustain Prod Consum 2024;50:314–26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spc.2024.08.003. [B2447]

Repke T, Müller-Hansen F, Cox E, Minx JC. Attention and positive sentiments towards carbon dioxide removal have grown on social media over the past decade. Commun Earth Environ 2024;5:763. https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247-024-01914-6. [B2910]

Rhein S, Bernauer T. Do policy packages that mitigate uncertainty over long-term policy benefits increase support for costly climate action? J Eur Public Policy 2025;33(5):1467–93. https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2025.2470313. [B7537]

Ricci M, Bellaby P, Flynn R. Engaging the public on paths to sustainable energy: who has to trust whom? Energy Policy 2010;38(6):2633–40. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2009.05.038. [B1159]

Ricci M, Bellaby P, Flynn R. What do we know about public perceptions and acceptance of hydrogen? A critical review and new case study evidence. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2008;33(21):5868–80. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2008.07.106. [B469]

Riesch H, Oltra C, Lis A, Upham P, Pol M. Internet-based public debate of CCS: lessons from online focus groups in Poland and Spain. Energy Policy 2013;56:693–702. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2013.01.029. [B2987]

Ringel M, Stöckigt G, Shamon H, Vögele S. Green hydrogen cooperation between Egypt and Europe: the perspective of locals in Suez and Port Said. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2024;79:1501–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2024.06.239. [B767]

Roberts BR, White MP, Davison SMC, McMeel O, Eatock C, Kellett P, et al. Public preferences for policy intervention to protect public health from maritime activities: a 14 European country study. Glob Environ Change 2021;71:102397. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2021.102397. [B6738]

Rudolph D. The resurgent conflict between offshore wind farms and tourism: underlying storylines. Scott Geogr J 2014;130(3):168–87. https://doi.org/10.1080/14702541.2014.914239 [C173]

Russell A, Firestone J, Bidwell D, Gardner M. Place meaning and consistency with offshore wind: an island and coastal tale. Renew Sustain Energy Rev 2020;132:110044. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2020.110044. [B6374]

Russell A, Firestone J. Community cognitive and affective perceptions of land-based and ocean wind energy infrastructure. Sci Talks 2022;4:100090. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sctalk.2022.100090. [B6855]

Russell A, Firestone J. More than a feeling: analyzing community cognitive and affective perceptions of the Block Island offshore wind project. Renew Energy 2022;193:214–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2022.05.032. [B6385]

Sadat-Razavi P, Karakislak I, Hildebrand J. German media discourses and public perceptions on hydrogen imports: an energy justice perspective. Energy Technol 2024;13:2301000. https://doi.org/10.1002/ente.202301000. [B771]

Sahagún-Aguilar F, Hurlbert M. Impact on SMR support by teaching low-dose radiation using infographics and social license in Canada. Acad Green Energy 2025;2(3). https://doi.org/10.20935/acadenergy7858. [B194]

Saito A, Itaoka K, Akai M. Those who care about CCS—results from a Japanese survey on public understanding of CCS. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2019;84:121–30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2019.02.014. [B2563]

Sala R, Gonçalves L, Huan N, Sato H, Yamamoto T, Yin H, et al. Public acceptance of hydrogen technologies and hydrogen refuelling stations in Spain. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2025;142:752–63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2025.04.089. [B423]

Sala R, Gonçalves L, Sato H, Huan N, Yamamoto T, Tzioutzios D, et al. Determining the Spanish public's intention to adopt hydrogen fuel-cell vehicles. World Electr Veh J 2025;16:436. https://doi.org/10.3390/wevj16080436. [B880]

Salleh N, Chew BC, Hamid SR. Renewable energy adoption for energy complementary: application of offshore wind turbines in Sabah, Malaysia. J Technol Manag Bus 2016;3(2):82–93. [no DOI] [B6884]

San Román-Niaves M, Morandini S, Pietrantoni L. How trust in stakeholders shapes social acceptance of carbon capture and storage. J Risk Res 2026;29(3):305–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2026.2636954. [B3848]

Satterfield T, Nawaz S, St-Laurent GP. Exploring public acceptability of direct air carbon capture with storage: climate urgency, moral hazards and perceptions of the 'whole versus the parts'. Clim Change 2023;176:14. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-023-03483-7. [B2320]

Saxe M, Folkesson A, Alvfors P. A follow-up and conclusive report on the attitude towards hydrogen fuel cell buses in the CUTE project—from passengers in Stockholm to bus operators in Europe. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2007;32(17):4295–305. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2007.07.050. [B16003]

Scheer D, Konrad W, Scheel O. Public evaluation of electricity technologies and future low-carbon portfolios in Germany and the USA. Energy Sustain Soc 2013;3:8. https://doi.org/10.1186/2192-0567-3-8. [B3627]

Schmidt A. Need for a wind of change? Use of offshore wind messages by stakeholders and the media in Germany and their effects on public acceptance. J Environ Plan Manag 2016;60(8):1391–411. https://doi.org/10.1080/09640568.2016.1221799. [B6403]

Schneider MJ, O'Neill BF. 'Thank you in advance for not changing my retirement home's intrinsic beauty': NIMBYism, environmental privilege and the politics of offshore wind energy. Coast Stud Soc 2025;4(1):54–83. https://doi.org/10.1177/26349817251315582 [C23]

Schneider S. The takeover of science communication: how science lost its leading role in the public discourse on carbon capture and storage research in daily newspapers in Germany. Geosci Commun 2019;2(1):69–82. https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2-69-2019. [B12952]

Schomakers EM, Engelmann L, Ziefle M. Public preferences for local carbon capture and utilization implementation: a French-German comparison. Energy Policy 2025;206:114781. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2025.114781. [B3105]

Schreiber J, Scherrer A, Breetz HL. Driving discussion: media framing of electric, hydrogen, and conventional vehicles in German newspapers and Twitter. Energy Res Soc Sci 2023;103:103193. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2023.103193. [B1127]

Schönauer AL, Glanz S. Hydrogen in future energy systems: social acceptance of the technology and its large-scale infrastructure. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2022;47(24):12251–63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2021.05.160. [B633]

Scott-Buechler C, Cain B, Osman K, Ardoin NM, Fraser C, Adcox G, et al. Communities conditionally support deployment of direct air capture for carbon dioxide removal in the United States. Commun Earth Environ 2024;5:175. https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247-024-01334-6. [B2315]

Scott-Buechler C, Wang KH. Navigating uncertainty: direct air capture and just transition perspectives in Gulf Coast communities. Environ Res Lett 2025;20(9):094042. https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/adf5d7. [B3073]

Scovell M, Walton A. Blue or green? Exploring Australian acceptance and beliefs about hydrogen production methods. J Clean Prod 2024;444:141151. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2024.141151. [B619]

Scovell M, Walton A. Identifying informed beliefs about hydrogen technologies across the energy supply chain. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2023;48(82):31825–36. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2023.04.242. [B1124]

Senkpiel C, Berneiser J, Baumann D. Open-source simulation of the long-term diffusion of alternative passenger cars on the basis of investment decisions of private persons. Transp Res Part D Transp Environ 2021;93:102713. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2021.102713. [B1597]

Shah P, Wang W, Yang JZ, Kahlor L, Anderson J. Framing climate change mitigation technology: the impact of risk versus benefit messaging on support for carbon capture and storage. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2022;119:103737. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2022.103737. [B2772]

Shah P, Yang JZ, Kahlor L. Psychological distance, risk perception, and affect: Texas residents' support for carbon capture and storage. J Risk Res 2022;26(2):184–98. https://doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2022.2116084. [B2527]

Shaheen SA, Martin E, Lipman TE. Dynamics in behavioral response to fuel-cell vehicle fleet and hydrogen fueling infrastructure. Transp Res Rec 2008;2058(1):155–62. https://doi.org/10.3141/2058-19. [B642]

Shamon H, Schumann D, Fischer W, Vögele S, Heinrichs HU, Kuckshinrichs W. Changing attitudes and conflicting arguments: reviewing stakeholder communication on electricity technologies in Germany. Energy Res Soc Sci 2019;55:106–21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2019.04.012. [B816]

Sharp JD, Jaccard MK, Keith DW. Anticipating public attitudes toward underground CO2 storage. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2009;3(5):641–51. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2009.04.001. [B2275]

Sherry-Brennan F, Devine-Wright H, Devine-Wright P. Public understanding of hydrogen energy: a theoretical approach. Energy Policy 2010;38(10):5311–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2009.03.037. [B574]

Sie A, Brechin SR, Borick CP. Geoengineering prioritization: a study of a proposed expression of mitigation deterrence. Clim Change 2025;178(11):194. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-025-04026-y. [B8165]

Simons L, Engelmann L, Arning K, Ziefle M. Two sides of the same coin—explaining the acceptance of CO2-based fuels for aviation using PLS-SEM by considering the production and product evaluation. Front Energy Res 2021;9:742109. https://doi.org/10.3389/fenrg.2021.742109. [B2979]

Simons L, Ziefle M, Arning K. How to shape communication for CO2-derived insulation boards considering different accepter profiles. Environ Dev Sustain 2023;26(10):25367–96. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-023-03683-2. [B3707]

Simons L, Ziefle M, Arning K. The social acceptance factors for insulation boards produced with CO2-derived foam. Front Energy Res 2021;9:717975. https://doi.org/10.3389/fenrg.2021.717975. [B3066]

Siron R, Kasavan S, Jaaffar AH. The public perception of adopting hydrogen fuel cell vehicles in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. Malays J Soc Space 2023;19(1). https://doi.org/10.17576/geo-2023-1901-13. [B601]

Sitinjak C, Ebennezer S, Ober J. Exploring public attitudes and acceptance of CCUS technologies in JABODETABEK: a cross-sectional study. Energies 2023;16(10):4026. https://doi.org/10.3390/en16104026. [B2341]

Sloot D, Bostrom A. The role of framing in public support for direct air capture: a moral hazard survey experiment in the United States. Energy Res Soc Sci 2024;116:103694. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2024.103694. [B2619]

Smith C, Bucke C, van der Horst D. Green hydrogen powering sustainable festivals: public perceptions of generators, production and ownership. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2023;48(23):8370–85. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2022.11.171. [B577]

Sokoloski R, Markowitz EM, Bidwell D. Public estimates of support for offshore wind energy: false consensus, pluralistic ignorance, and partisan effects. Energy Policy 2018;112:45–55. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2017.10.005. [B6346]

Son W, Lee S, Woo J. Community acceptance of hydrogen power plant projects: the case of South Korea. Renew Sustain Energy Rev 2023;187:113778. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2023.113778. [B709]

Sonnberger M, Ruddat M. Local and socio-political acceptance of wind farms in Germany. Technol Soc 2017;51:56–65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2017.07.005. [B6342]

Southall GD, Khare A. The feasibility of distributed hydrogen production from renewable energy sources and the financial contribution from UK motorists on environmental grounds. Sustain Cities Soc 2016;26:134–49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2016.05.009. [B690]

Sovacool BK, Baum CM, Fritz L. Minority groups, Indigenousness and Indigeneity, and place in social perceptions of future climate interventions. World Dev 2024;183:106719. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2024.106719. [B2830]

Spyridonidou S. “Act local, impact global”: mapping the social acceptance of offshore wind energy in Greece and advancing social engagement planning processes. Energy Res Soc Sci 2025;130:104434. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2025.104434. [B6799]

Srinitiworawong P, Kiattisin S. Explaining public acceptance of small modular reactors in Thailand: planned behavior, innovation attributes, moral norms, risk–benefit, and knowledge sharing. Energy Sustain Dev 2026;93:101985. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esd.2026.101985. [B111]

Stotts R, Lopez-Jaramillo OG, Kelley S, Krafft A, Kuby M. How drivers decide whether to get a fuel cell vehicle: an ethnographic decision model. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2021;46(12):8736–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2020.12.042. [B702]

Stranddorf L, Ladenburg J, Rönnblom A, Landström L, Olsen SI. Evaluating environmental impacts and public preferences in offshore wind farm decommissioning. Environ Impact Assess Rev 2026;118:108253. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eiar.2025.108253. [B6566]

Sun Y, Li Y, Cai BF, Li Q. Comparing the explicit and implicit attitudes of energy stakeholders and the public towards carbon capture and storage. J Clean Prod 2020;254:120051. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.120051. [B2395]

Sweet SK, Schuldt JP, Lehmann J, Bossio DA, Woolf D. Perceptions of naturalness predict US public support for soil carbon storage as a climate solution. Clim Change 2021;166:22. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-021-03121-0. [B2311]

Tafon R, Howarth D, Griggs S. The politics of Estonia's offshore wind energy programme: discourse, power and marine spatial planning. Environ Plan C Polit Space 2018;37(1):157–76. https://doi.org/10.1177/2399654418778037. [B6400]

Tao L, Gao L. Consumer preferences for hydrogen vehicles: an empirical analysis based on the choice experiment method. Sustain Environ 2025;10(1):80. https://doi.org/10.22158/se.v10n1p80. [B823]

Tarigan AKM, Bayer SB, Langhelle O, Thesen G. Estimating determinants of public acceptance of hydrogen vehicles and refuelling stations in greater Stavanger. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2012;37(7):6063–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2011.12.138. [B415]

Tarigan AKM, Bayer SB. Temporal change analysis of public attitude, knowledge and acceptance of hydrogen vehicles in Greater Stavanger, 2006–2009. Renew Sustain Energy Rev 2012;16(8):5535–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2012.05.045. [B506]

Teisl MF, McCoy S, Marrinan S, Noblet CL, Johnson T, Wibberly M, et al. Will offshore energy face “fair winds and following seas”?: understanding the factors influencing offshore wind acceptance. Estuaries Coasts 2014;38(S1):279–86. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12237-014-9777-6. [B6379]

Teisl MF, Noblet CL, Corey RR, Giudice NA. Seeing clearly in a virtual reality: tourist reactions to an offshore wind project. Energy Policy 2018;122:601–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2018.08.018. [B6382]

Tenbrink T, Dalton T, Livermore J. The impact of an offshore wind farm on commercial and recreational fishermen. ESSOAr [preprint] 2018. https://doi.org/10.1002/essoar.10500194.1. [B6806]

ter Mors E, Terwel BW, Daamen DDL, Reiner DM, Schumann D, Anghel S, et al. A comparison of techniques used to collect informed public opinions about CCS: opinion quality after focus group discussions versus information-choice questionnaires. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2013;18:256–63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2013.07.015. [B2537]

ter Mors E, van Leeuwen E, Boomsma C, Meier R. Media coverage of carbon capture and storage: an analysis of established and emerging themes in Dutch national newspapers. Energies 2023;16(4):2056. https://doi.org/10.3390/en16042056. [B2819]

ter Mors E, van Leeuwen E. It matters to be heard: increasing the citizen acceptance of low-carbon technologies in the Netherlands and United Kingdom. Energy Res Soc Sci 2023;100:103103. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2023.103103. [B2968]

Terwel BW, Daamen DDL. Initial public reactions to carbon capture and storage (CCS): differentiating general and local views. Clim Policy 2012;12(3):288–300. https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2011.637819. [B2357]

Terwel BW, Harinck F, Ellemers N, Daamen DDL. Competence-based and integrity-based trust as predictors of acceptance of carbon dioxide capture and storage (CCS). Risk Anal 2009;29(8):1129–40. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.2009.01256.x. [B2252]

Terwel BW, ter Mors E, Daamen DDL. It's not only about safety: beliefs and attitudes of 811 local residents regarding a CCS project in Barendrecht. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2012;9:41–51. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2012.02.017. [B2300]

Terwel BW, ter Mors E. Host community compensation in a carbon dioxide capture and storage (CCS) context: comparing the preferences of Dutch citizens and local government authorities. Environ Sci Policy 2015;50:15–23. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2015.01.015. [B2492]

Thesen G, Langhelle O. Awareness, acceptability and attitudes towards hydrogen vehicles and filling stations: a Greater Stavanger case study and comparisons with London. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2008;33(21):5859–67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2008.07.006. [B461]

Thiel Z. Public support for renewable hydrogen and complementary climate measures: experimental evidence from Germany. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2026;210:153214. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2025.153214. [B1287]

Thomas G, Pidgeon N, Roberts E. Ambivalence, naturalness and normality in public perceptions of carbon capture and storage in biomass, fossil energy, and industrial applications in the United Kingdom. Energy Res Soc Sci 2018;46:1–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2018.06.007. [B2326]

Tokushige K, Akimoto K, Tomoda T. Public acceptance and risk-benefit perception of CO2 geological storage for global warming mitigation in Japan. Mitig Adapt Strateg Glob Change 2006;12(7):1237–51. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11027-006-9037-6. [B2323]

Tokushige K, Akimoto K, Tomoda T. Public perceptions on the acceptance of geological storage of carbon dioxide and information influencing the acceptance. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2007;1(1):101–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1750-5836(07)00020-5. [B2262]

Trandafir S, Gaur V, Behanan P, Uchida E, Lang C, Miao H. How are tourists affected by offshore wind turbines? A case study of the first U.S. offshore wind farm. J Ocean Coast Econ 2020;7(1). https://doi.org/10.15351/2373-8456.1127. [B6419]

Traylor F, Brechin S, Shwom R. Comparing the effects of information on geoengineering options support across four online samples. Clim Change 2025;178(12):240. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-025-04029-9. [B5826]

Troise S, Morgan MG, Abdulla A. Public attitudes towards electricity decarbonization and meeting 2035 goals. Energy 2024;313:133889. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2024.133889. [B3098]

Turner E, Erdiaw-Kwasie MO. Exploring residents' perceptions of offshore wind farms in Western Australia: a qualitative investigation. Sustainability 2025;17(15):6880. https://doi.org/10.3390/su17156880. [B6529]

Tyquin E, Weeks CS, Mehta A, Newton C. Delivering an energy export transition: impact of conflicting and competing informational contexts on public acceptance of Australia's hydrogen export industry. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2024;61:226–37. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2024.02.185. [B1104]

Ugarte-Lucas P, Jacobsen JB. Public perception of bioenergy with carbon capture and storage in Denmark: support or reluctant acceptance? Int J Greenh Gas Control 2024;136:104187. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2024.104187. [B2515]

Upham P, Johansen K. A cognitive mess: mixed feelings about wind farms on the Danish coast and the emotions of energy infrastructure opposition. Energy Res Soc Sci 2020;66:101489. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2020.101489. [B12178]

Upham P, Roberts T. Public perceptions of CCS: emergent themes in pan-European focus groups and implications for communications. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2011;5(5):1359–67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2011.06.005. [B2314]

Upham PJ, Ibrahimović E. Media frame development of direct air capture 2011–2023: a comparative analysis of Europe and North America. iScience 2024;27(12):111360. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isci.2024.111360. [B3099]

van Alphen K, van Voorst tot Voorst Q, Hekkert MP, Smits REHM. Societal acceptance of carbon capture and storage technologies. Energy Policy 2007;35(8):4368–80. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2007.03.006. [B2273]

van der Wurff R, De Swert K, Lecheler S. News quality and public opinion: the impact of deliberative quality of news media on citizens' argument repertoire. Int J Public Opin Res 2016:edw024. https://doi.org/10.1093/ijpor/edw024. [B2960]

van Heek J, Arning K, Ziefle M. Reduce, reuse, recycle: acceptance of CO2-utilization for plastic products. Energy Policy 2017;105:53–66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2017.02.016. [B2503]

van Rensburg TM, Brennan N, Howard A. Tourist preferences for fuel cell vehicle rental: going green with hydrogen on the island of Tenerife. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2023;48(75):29350–66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2023.03.435. [B698]

van Rensburg TM, Brennan N. Understanding public preferences towards Ireland's offshore wind sector: a study on renewable energy trade, public involvement, and setback distance. Mar Policy 2024;160:105988. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2023.105988. [B6625]

Vecchiato D. How do you like wind farms? Understanding people's preferences about new energy landscapes with choice experiments. Aestimum 2014:15–37. https://doi.org/10.13128/aestimum-14707. [B6428]

Voltaire L, Koutchade OP. Public acceptance of and heterogeneity in behavioral beach trip responses to offshore wind farm development in Catalonia (Spain). Resour Energy Econ 2020;60:101152. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reseneeco.2020.101152. [B6347]

Waldo Å. Offshore wind power in Sweden—a qualitative analysis of attitudes with particular focus on opponents. Energy Policy 2012;41:692–702. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2011.11.033. [B6288]

Wallquist L, Seigo SL, Visschers VHM, Siegrist M. Public acceptance of CCS system elements: a conjoint measurement. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2012;6:77–83. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2011.11.008. [B2279]

Wallquist L, Visschers VHM, Dohle S, Siegrist M. Adapting communication to the public's intuitive understanding of CCS. Greenh Gases Sci Technol 2011;1(1):83–91. https://doi.org/10.1002/ghg3.4. [B2694]

Wallquist L, Visschers VHM, Dohle S, Siegrist M. The role of convictions and trust for public protest potential in the case of carbon dioxide capture and storage (CCS). Hum Ecol Risk Assess 2012;18(4):919–32. https://doi.org/10.1080/10807039.2012.688719. [B2298]

Wallquist L, Visschers VHM, Siegrist M. Impact of knowledge and misconceptions on benefit and risk perception of CCS. Environ Sci Technol 2010;44(17):6557–62. https://doi.org/10.1021/es1005412 [C104]

Wallquist L, Visschers VHM, Siegrist M. Lay concepts on CCS deployment in Switzerland based on qualitative interviews. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2009;3(5):652–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2009.03.005. [B2477]

Wang Y, Li W, Gu S. Farmers’ attitude towards green ammonia produced by upcycling waste nitrogen: empirical evidence from an Iowa study. Sustain Futures 2025;9:100450. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sftr.2025.100450. [B808]

Waring T, Longo A. Implementing carbon capture and storage in the United Kingdom: estimating willingness to pay through a contingent valuation survey. Environ Manage 2025;75(6):1432–43. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-025-02174-6. [B2446]

Warren DC, Carley SR, Krause RM, Rupp JA, Graham JD. Predictors of attitudes toward carbon capture and storage using data on world views and CCS-specific attitudes. Sci Public Policy 2014;41(6):821–34. https://doi.org/10.1093/scipol/scu016. [B2391]

Wenger A, Stauffacher M, Dallo I. Public perception and acceptance of negative emission technologies – framing effects in Switzerland. Clim Change 2021;167:53. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-021-03150-9. [B2296]

Westerberg V, Jacobsen JB, Lifran R. Offshore wind farms in Southern Europe – determining tourist preference and social acceptance. Energy Res Soc Sci 2015;10:165–79. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2015.07.005. [B6301]

Westerberg V, Jacobsen JB, Lifran R. The case for offshore wind farms, artificial reefs and sustainable tourism in the French Mediterranean. Tour Manag 2013;34:172–83. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2012.04.008. [B6299]

Westlake S, John CHD, Cox E. Perception spillover from fracking onto public perceptions of novel energy technologies. Nat Energy 2023;8(2):149–58. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41560-022-01178-4. [B555]

Whitmarsh L, Xenias D, Jones CR. Framing effects on public support for carbon capture and storage. Palgrave Commun 2019;5:17. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-019-0217-x. [B2267]

Wilkowska W, Haverkämper I, Ziefle M. Who's willing to take the green leap? Consumers' preferences and their willingness to use different carbon capture and utilization products. Clean Responsible Consum 2025;19:100355. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clrc.2025.100355. [B4258]

Wilkowska W, Haverkämper IT, Ziefle M. Worlds apart? Investigating acceptance and usage demands of carbon-based cosmetics and clothing across European countries. Energy Sustain Soc 2024;14:24. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13705-024-00454-3. [B3278]

Williams G, Rolfe J. Willingness to pay for emissions reduction: application of choice modeling under uncertainty and different management options. Energy Econ 2017;62:302–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2017.01.004. [B2680]

Williams R, Jack C, Gamboa D, Shackley S. Decarbonising steel production using CO2 capture and storage (CCS): results of focus group discussions in a Welsh steel-making community. Int J Greenh Gas Control 2021;104:103218. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2020.103218. [B2434]

Witt K, Ferguson M, Ashworth P. Understanding the public's response towards 'enhanced water recovery' in the Great Artesian Basin (Australia) using the carbon capture and storage process. Hydrogeol J 2019;28(1):427–37. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10040-019-02066-0. [B3152]

Wolff FC, Mahieu PA, Trouillet B, Pigeault A, Rollo N. Participatory democracy in question: the case of "the sea in debate". Ecol Econ 2026;243:108916. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2026.108916. [B7427]

Wolsink M. Near-shore wind power—protected seascapes, environmentalists' attitudes, and the technocratic planning perspective. Land Use Policy 2010;27(2):195–203. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2009.04.004. [B15621]

Wolske KS, Raimi KT, Campbell-Arvai V, Hart PS. Public support for carbon dioxide removal strategies: the role of tampering with nature perceptions. Clim Change 2019;152(3–4):345–61. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-019-02375-z. [B2251]

Wong-Parodi G, Dowlatabadi H, McDaniels T, Ray I. Influencing attitudes toward carbon capture and sequestration: a social marketing approach. Environ Sci Technol 2011;45(16):6743–51. https://doi.org/10.1021/es201391g. [B2376]

Wulf C, Zapp P. Sustainability assessment of innovative energy technologies – hydrogen from wind power as a fuel for mobility applications. J Sustain Dev Energy Water Environ Syst 2021;9(3):1–21. https://doi.org/10.13044/j.sdewes.d8.0371. [B898]

Wædegaard M, Hvemon S, Pedersen MJ. Can media influence public support for carbon capture and storage? Comparing the impacts of frames in Denmark. Energy Res Soc Sci 2024;110:103452. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2024.103452. [B2473]

Xexakis G, Trutnevyte E. Consensus on future EU electricity supply among citizens of France, Germany, and Poland: implications for modeling. Energy Strategy Rev 2021;38:100742. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esr.2021.100742. [B3632]

Xexakis G, Trutnevyte E. Model-based scenarios of EU27 electricity supply are not aligned with the perspectives of French, German, and Polish citizens. Renew Sustain Energy Transit 2022;2:100031. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rset.2022.100031. [B11307]

Xiao T, Middleton E, Bakelli O, Cheng S, Zhu D, Xu L, et al. Public perceptions and engagement for carbon capture, utilization, and storage: literature review with a case study of Utah, USA. Greenh Gases Sci Technol 2025;16(1):125–57. https://doi.org/10.1002/ghg.2381. [B2856]

Xie J, Xian Y, Jia G. An investigation into the public acceptance in China of carbon capture and storage (CCS) technology. Mitig Adapt Strateg Glob Change 2023;28:27. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11027-023-10065-6. [B2455]

Xu Y, Liu B, Chen Y, Lu S. Public perceived risks and benefits of carbon capture, utilization, and storage (CCUS): scale development and validation. J Environ Manage 2023;347:119109. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2023.119109. [B2416]

Yang HJ, Cho Y, Yoo SH. Public willingness to pay for hydrogen stations expansion policy in Korea: results of a contingent valuation survey. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2017;42(16):10739–46. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2017.02.079. [B460]

Yang L, Zhang X, McAlinden KJ. The effect of trust on people's acceptance of CCS (carbon capture and storage) technologies: evidence from a survey in the People's Republic of China. Energy 2016;96:69–79. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2015.12.044. [B2295]

Yang Y, Wong-Parodi G, Fischhoff B. How stable are preferences among emerging electricity generation technologies. Environ Res Commun 2019;1:071002. https://doi.org/10.1088/2515-7620/ab2ec0. [B136]

Yap J, McLellan B. Evaluating the attitudes of Japanese society towards the hydrogen economy: a comparative study of recent and past community surveys. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2024;54:66–83. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2023.05.174. [B532]

Ye T, Zhao S, Lau CKM, Chau F. Social media sentiment of hydrogen fuel cell vehicles in China: evidence from artificial intelligence algorithms. Energy Econ 2024;133:107564. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2024.107564. [B650]

Yoo J, Hyun MK, Yoo SH. Economic valuation of hydrogen production using renewable methane in South Korea. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2026;202:153034. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2025.153034. [B1436]

Zhou Y, Liu Z, Kato T, Shi C, Xu T, Gao W. Decoding the mechanisms influencing public acceptance of carbon dioxide capture and storage technology in China. Energy 2024;313:133888. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2024.133888. [B2539]

Ziegler A. Individual characteristics and stated preferences for alternative energy sources and propulsion technologies in vehicles: a discrete choice analysis for Germany. Transp Res Part A Policy Pract 2012;46(8):1372–85. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2012.05.016. [B1044]

Zimmer R, Welke J. Let's go green with hydrogen! The general public's perspective. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2012;37(22):17502–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2012.02.126. [B1105]

Zlateva P, Murzova M, Terziev A, Yordanov K, Mileva NM. Hydrogen from waste plastics as a low-carbon energy pathway: a socio-technical assessment of thermochemical conversion and market acceptance. Energies 2026;19:2746. https://doi.org/10.3390/en19122746. [B1767]

Çiğdem Ş, Yıldız B, Kaya S, Kütahyalı DN. Bridging awareness and intention in sustainable mobility: a value–belief–norm-informed technology acceptance analysis of hydrogen fuel cell vehicle purchase intention. Sustainability 2026;18:6864. https://doi.org/10.3390/su18136864. [B1388]