Title: Descriptive table for each hand-coded conspiracy related variables appendix for "Conspiracy and debunking narratives about COVID-19 origins on Chinese social media: How it started and who is to blame"

Authors: Kaiping Chen (1), Anfan Chen (2), Jingwen Zhang (3), Jingbo Meng (4), Cuihua Shen (3)

Date: December 10th, 2020

Note: The material contained herein is supplementary to the article named in the title and published in the Harvard

Kennedy School (HKS) Misinformation Review.

Appendix C: Descriptive table for each hand-coded conspiracy related variables

The coding scheme was iteratively developed and pilot-tested with 100 randomly sampled Weibo posts from the final dataset. Six Chinese native speakers were trained and coded the posts independently. Intercoder-reliability was satisfactory, with Krippendorff's alpha for post type, origin types, responsibility attribution, and source cited at 0.834, 0.786, 0.804, 0.826, respectively. The table below provides the descriptive results of coding of each variable.

Variable Name	Distribution	N
Post Types	· Conspiracy posts = 923	6735
	• Debunking posts = 593	
	• Irrelevant to conspiracies or debunking =5219	
Origin Types	• Nature/unknown origin = 350	1516 (subset to post types = conspiracy or debunking)
	• Human synthesis = 563	
	· Lab-edited = 636	
	· Bioweapon = 188	
	• 5G = 75	
	• E-cigarette = 0	
	• GMO = 7	
Responsibility Attribution	· China = 565	1516
	• The United States = 712	
	· Japan = 4	
	· Serbia = 1	
	• European Countries = 24	
	• Bill Gates = 2	
	· Other Countries = 36	
	No clear responsibility attribution = 217	
		4545
Source Cited	Chinese government = 47	1516
	• U.S. government = 13	
	• Other government = 36	
	• Scientists/Scholars = 438	

- Celebrities = 52
- Ordinary citizens = 234
- Foreign media = 261
- · Chinese media = 280
- Corporations = 2
- NGO = 5
- Others = 108
- No source is cited in a post = 268