

Overall Assessment

The revised manuscript has improved substantially. The article now presents a clearer focus on how media narratives on child maltreatment in South Korea shifted before and after the implementation of the Inclusive-State Child Policy. The manuscript is important because it connects media discourse, child protection policy, and public understanding of child maltreatment. The revised version also provides a stronger explanation of the study's purpose, methodology, findings, policy implications, and limitations. Overall, the manuscript is suitable for publication after minor revisions.

Title

The title is appropriate and clearly reflects the content of the manuscript. It identifies the main topic, geographic focus, methodology, and policy relevance. The title, "Shifting media narratives on child maltreatment in Korea: Policy implications from a semantic network analysis of the Inclusive-State Child Policy," is clear and scholarly. No major change is needed.

Abstract

The abstract is now clearer and more comprehensive. It identifies the problem, policy context, research design, data source, methodology, major findings, and implications. The abstract effectively explains that the study used a pre-post media analysis of 2,463 online news articles from 2017 to 2022 and found a shift from incident-centered reporting toward broader discussions of government accountability, systemic prevention, and child rights.

However, the abstract could still benefit from minor language editing to improve flow and conciseness. Some sentences are long and could be shortened for readability.

Introduction

The introduction has been strengthened. It provides a useful background on child maltreatment as a global and Korean social issue. It also explains the relevance of the Inclusive-State Child Policy and connects the study to broader international scholarship on media framing and child protection. The introduction clearly identifies the gap in previous Korean studies, especially the limited use of longitudinal computational analysis to examine media discourse across different forms of child maltreatment.

The section is generally strong, but it could be improved by ensuring consistency in the timeline. The manuscript refers to the Inclusive-State Child Policy as introduced in 2019, while the post-policy analysis begins in January 2020. The authors should clarify this timeline to avoid confusion.

Methods

The methods section is much improved and provides a more detailed explanation of the data collection and analysis process. The authors clearly explain that articles were collected

from Naver News across two periods: July 2017 to December 2019 and January 2020 to June 2022. They also explain the use of six keywords related to child maltreatment and describe the refinement process that reduced the initial 156,125 articles to a final dataset of 2,463 articles.

The explanation of preprocessing, TF-IDF weighting, semantic network analysis, centrality measures, and modularity analysis is useful. However, some methodological descriptions remain dense and may be difficult for readers who are less familiar with computational methods. The authors may consider simplifying some sentences or adding brief explanations of why each centrality measure is important for interpreting media discourse.

Results

The results section clearly presents the main finding that media coverage before the policy reform was more incident-driven and punitive, while post-policy discourse showed greater attention to systemic response, welfare support, prevention, and public responsibility. The results are consistent with the study's purpose and are supported by Tables 2 and 3.

However, the authors should carefully review the formatting and accuracy of the centrality values in the tables. Some values appear unusual, particularly the very large betweenness and eigenvector centrality values for "Welfare" and "Child welfare" in Table 3. These should be checked to ensure there are no formatting or calculation errors.

Discussion

The discussion is strong and connects the findings to broader child welfare policy and media framing literature. The authors effectively explain that media discourse shifted from individual blame and punitive framing toward more systemic and welfare-oriented themes. The discussion also appropriately acknowledges that punitive and judicial language remains prominent, suggesting that welfare-oriented discourse is still developing.

This section is especially useful because it connects the findings to policy developments in Korea, including strengthened reporting systems, legal frameworks, victim support, and child welfare services. The discussion also appropriately recognizes the role of media in shaping public understanding and policy legitimacy.

Policy and Practice Implications

The policy and practice implications are relevant and well developed. The authors provide practical recommendations, including coordinated cross-sectoral responses, public-led inquiries into severe child maltreatment cases, strategic media engagement, and ethical media reporting. The recommendation to develop evidence-based media reporting guidelines is particularly important and strengthens the practical contribution of the article.

This section could be improved slightly by making the recommendations more concise and clearly organized. Some points overlap and could be combined for stronger readability.

Limitations

The limitations section is appropriate and demonstrates stronger critical reflection. The authors acknowledge important limitations, including reliance on Naver News, difficulty separating policy effects from event-driven media coverage, the relatively short 2.5-year analysis window, and the limitations of TF-IDF and semantic network analysis in capturing deeper contextual meaning.

These limitations are well stated and strengthen the manuscript's credibility. No major additional limitations are needed.

Conclusion

The conclusion is clear and appropriately summarizes the study's contribution. It emphasizes that child protection in Korea has become a matter of public responsibility and that media discourse has evolved alongside policy reforms. The conclusion also appropriately notes that media coverage continues to emphasize punitive responses more than prevention, recovery, and structural causes of maltreatment.

References

The reference list is generally relevant and includes recent sources. However, the authors should carefully review the references for consistency, formatting, and accuracy. Some references appear incomplete or may need correction. For example, some entries lack publication details, use inconsistent formatting, or repeat references to the Ministry of Health and Welfare. A final reference check is recommended before publication.

Final Recommendation

I recommend acceptance after minor revisions.

The revised manuscript has addressed many of the major concerns and is now clearer, stronger, and more publishable. The remaining issues are minor and mainly relate to language editing, timeline consistency, table formatting, and reference accuracy.