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Dear Dr. Belizán,

Please find submitted a revised version of the manuscript “The Discourses on Induced Abortion in Ugandan Daily Newspapers: A Discourse Analysis”.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to revise and resend our manuscript. We hope that you will find the alterations we have made satisfactory and that you will find our manuscript suitable for publication in your distinguished journal.

We found the comments and suggestions from the reviewers helpful and constructive, and believe that the manuscript has improved. We have tried to accommodate the reviewers’ suggestions and followed most of the proposed alterations. Please find the referees’ comments and our responses to them below.

We believe that this manuscript provides increased knowledge on ways in which induced abortion is represented and morally assessed in Ugandan newspapers and on what role abortion stigma plays in particular country contexts. We hope that you will find the revised manuscript improved and interesting for the readership of BMC Reproductive Health.

With best regards,

Sofia Larsson (On behalf of all authors)
Below you find the referees' comments and our responses to them.

**Reviewer #1:**
*There should be at least two independent data extractors and a consensus procedure for disagreements should be in place. The sources are limit and comprehensive articles search was not performed. A list of included and excluded studies should be provided (please include a table).*

**Authors’ response:**
We thank the reviewer for her comments. In order to increase the transparency of this study, the description of the selection process and the analytical procedure has been clarified. The study has, however, been conducted in line with the premises and established procedures of discourse analysis (see for instance Fairclough, N. (2003). Analysing discourse: textual analysis for social research. New York, Routledge) and thus we have not made the suggested changes in terms of the selection process of newspaper articles to be included in the corpus. We hope that the reviewer finds the description of the selection process and analytical procedure more clear following the alterations.

**Reviewer #2:**
*This is a clearly written paper on an important topic. The authors provide interesting insights into the ways in which induced abortion is represented and morally assessed in Ugandan newspapers. The questions they pursue are highly relevant for a more thorough understanding of abortion stigma in particular country contexts. The methods are sound and well described. The suggestions for revisions that I have are relatively minor (“minor essential revisions”):*

1. **Background:** I will strongly recommend that the authors engage more directly with the most recent literature on abortion stigma. See for instance the latest issue of Women and Health:
   [http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/wwah20/current#.VEZgC1ZRFpi](http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/wwah20/current#.VEZgC1ZRFpi)

2. **Results:** The articles analyzed in this paper come from two different newspapers, one state-run and one independent. Yet the analysis does not distinguish between the newspapers. This raises the question of whether the two identified discourses were equally strong in both newspapers, and if so, why/why not?

3. **Discussion:** The discussion focuses mainly on Uganda, but a broader, comparative discussion of these life/rights discourses (which exist in many countries around the world and have been described by many other researchers) would be relevant and important. Think for instance of Faye Ginsburg’s classic “Contested Lives. The Abortion Debate in an American Community.”

4. **Conclusion:** The concluding section is rather weak and could be strengthened (for instance by taking the above points into consideration).

**Authors’ response:**
We thank the reviewer for her comments and helpful suggestions. Below we respond to each point raised.
1. We very much appreciate the suggested articles on abortion stigma to some of which we have now referred in the background in order to increase the timeliness of the study.
2. Other than that the number of articles on abortion shifted between the two different newspapers there was no difference in the way abortion tended to be described. This has now been clarified in the article.
3. In the discussion, as well as in the background, we have now made comparisons to other countries and contexts in terms of life/rights discourses related to abortion in order to better showcase the study’s relevance not only from a Ugandan perspective, but also on a larger scale.

4. We agree the concluding section was not clear enough. As suggested, the concluding section has now been strengthened as a more global perspective on abortion and stigma related to it has been taken into account.