

Reviewer # 1-1: The abstract could be more concise and should clearly state the research design (pre-post analysis).

Author Response: Thank you for this valuable comment. We revised the Abstract to improve conciseness and explicitly clarify the research design. Specifically, we added a clear description of the study as a pre-post comparative analysis examining media portrayals of child maltreatment before and after implementation of the Inclusive-State Child Policy. We also streamlined several sentences to enhance readability and overall clarity. Please refer to page 2.

Reviewer # 1-2: Strong and well-contextualized but somewhat lengthy and repetitive. Consider including more international literature to strengthen comparative relevance.

Author Response: We revised the Introduction to improve conciseness and reduce repetitive discussion regarding media discourse, policy reform, and institutional change. Several overlapping sections were streamlined and reorganized to improve overall flow and readability. In addition, we strengthened the international context by incorporating comparative literature from the US and Europe addressing media framing, child protection policy, and public perceptions of child maltreatment. These additions help situate the Korean case within broader international scholarship and enhance the comparative relevance of the study. See pages 3-5.

Reviewer # 1-3: While generally strong, the methods section would benefit from clearer justification of the exclusive use of Naver News and further explanation of filtering criteria and analytical decisions (e.g., TF-IDF thresholds).

Author Response: We appreciate the reviewer's thoughtful comment regarding the methodological transparency of our study. In response, we revised the Methods section to provide a clearer justification for the exclusive use of Naver News, which was selected as the largest and most widely used news aggregation platform in South Korea and a representative source of public-facing media discourse. We also added further details regarding the filtering process and analytical procedures, including keyword refinement, duplicate and irrelevant article removal, token cleaning, morphological analysis, and TF-IDF-based preprocessing decisions. These revisions were incorporated to improve methodological clarity and reproducibility. See pages 6-8.

Reviewer # 1-4: The manuscript tends to imply that policy implementation directly caused shifts in media discourse. Given the study design, findings should be framed more cautiously as associations. The potential influence of high-profile abuse cases and event-driven media coverage should be more explicitly acknowledged.

Author Response: We agree that the study design does not allow for causal inference regarding the relationship between policy implementation and changes in media discourse. In response, we revised the manuscript to adopt more cautions and precise language throughout the Results and Discussion sections. Specifically, expressions implying direct causal effect of policy implementation on media discourse were modified to emphasize temporal associations and observed shifts occurring in relation to the policy period rather than definitive causal impacts. See pages 18-19.

Reviewer # 1-5: Address minor inconsistencies and duplication in citations. Ensure formatting aligns with journal guidelines. The manuscript would benefit from reducing repetition, tightening the introduction and discussion, and addressing minor grammatical and formatting issues.

Author Response: We corrected overall inconsistencies and duplicate citations, revised grammatical and formatting issues, and ensured alignment with journal guidelines. We also reduced repetition and tightened the Introduction and Discussion for improved clarity and conciseness.

Reviewer # 1-6: Theoretical Integration: The paper would be strengthened by deeper engagement with media framing theory, particularly the distinction between episodic and thematic reporting, to better contextualize the findings.

Author Response: Thank you for this valuable suggestion. In response, we strengthened the theoretical integration of the manuscript by incorporating media framing theory, particularly the distinction between episodic and thematic reporting, into the Discussion section. See pages 13-15.

Reviewer # 1-7: Some conclusions based on keyword co-occurrence appear slightly overstated. The authors should acknowledge that semantic network analysis captures patterns in language use but not full contextual meaning.

Author Response: We revised the Results section to use more cautious interpretive language and clarified the methodological limitations of semantic network analysis. Specifically, we acknowledged that semantic network analysis identifies patterns of keyword association and language use rather than the full contextual meaning or intent of individual news reports. See pages 12-13.

Reviewer # 2-1: The Introduction section of the manuscript should be condensed to approximately 10% of the overall document length. To strengthen the article, the inclusion of a Literature Review section would be advantageous.

Author Response: We substantially condensed the Introduction section by reducing repetitive background information and focusing more directly on the study rationale, research gap, and objectives. We also strengthened the integration of prior research by incorporating a more structured review of relevant literature on media framing, child protection policy, and child maltreatment discourse within the Introduction. See pages 3-6.

Reviewer # 2-2: Additionally, the methodology requires clarification, as it is unclear whether the approach is quantitative, qualitative, or mixed methods.

Author Response: We revised the Methods section to more explicitly describe the study as a quantitative computational text analysis using TF-IDF-based keyword extraction and semantic network analysis of news articles.

Reviewer # 2-3: It is advisable for the authors to refrain from using first-person pronouns in their writing. In the context of developing a research project, terms such as "I," "we," "my," or "our" should be omitted. This practice helps to maintain objectivity and formality in the work.

Author Response: First-person pronouns were removed throughout the manuscript and replaced with more objective and formal expressions to improve academic tone and consistency.

Reviewer # 2-4: Furthermore, certain paragraphs necessitate condensation. In academic publications, paragraphs typically range from 100 to 200 words (approximately 3 to 8 sentences) and represent the standard unit for articulating a single, well-developed idea.

Author Response: Several overly long paragraphs throughout the manuscript were revised and condensed to improve clarity, coherence, and overall readability.