October, 22th 2023.

To the IJoC Editors and reviewers:

Manuscript ID: 20960-cd

First of all, thank you all for the great insights and comments on this study. A special thanks to the blind referees for their invaluable contribution to this article. Regarding the changes, this new version of the paper tried to answer all comments in the most appropriate way. Below you may find a table with all the previous suggestions and the proposed solution and justifications. All the changes made to the document have been highlighted.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Reviewer suggestion** | **Reviewer** | **Proposed solution** |
| Introduce a discussion on the limits of the categories chosen. And address if they were first from the data or from the literature | Reviewer A | We insert the references used to select these categories and expand the discussion on their uses and limitations. |
| Give more details about the period of time of the data collection and the Brazilian context | Reviewer A | More elements about the Brazilian context during the data collection period are inserted throughout the text. In addition, an excerpt specifically on this point was inserted on page 15. |
| Highlight the typology of discursive action in the conclusions | Reviewer A | This indication generated an adjustment highlighted in yellow in the conclusion section of the new version of the manuscript. |
| Restructure the abstract to present the main findings and clear what is being analyzed | Reviewer C | The abstract has been modified in line with the suggestions made. |
| The article makes several claims that are at least contested  and doesn't provide evidence to back them. One of them is in the first line of the article, saying that "The ever-faster sharing of political misleading on digital platforms have induced the radicalization of hyper-connected and polarized societies." We do not know if this is actually true, and a large part of research shows that digital platforms have very different effects on different parts of the population. In addition, it's hard to buy the causal implication here, given that we already know that other social and political elements are drivers of these radicalization processes, with mixed (when existent) impacts of digital platforms and media consumption. | Reviewer C | Following the request for correction, this entire open statement was rewritten. |
| Highlight in the introduction what gap this paper is addressing and why looking at harmful discursive actions from a cross-platform perspective is important | Reviewer C | This indication generated an adjustment highlighted in yellow in the introduction section of the new version of the manuscript. |
| Deepen the literature review and better relate it with the Political Communication (not linguistics) literature. Engage more with the literature about political conversation online, hate speech, uncivil content, etc. | Reviewer C | This request motivates the creation of a section articulating the literature between platforms, discursive types and political communication. The section was organized to guide the presentation of the research questions and hypotheses. |
| Better substantiate hypotheses. Why should we expect more harmful political content on WhatsApp than on Facebook? | Reviewer C | We recognize that the first text contained this omission and thank you for your comment. This discussion has been inserted into the new text section, entitled "Platforms, political communication and types of harmful discourses". |
| Address how political conversation happens on different digital platforms and what we know so far about it | Reviewer C | We understood that there were elements of this discussion in the description of some of the discursive types. But, in fact, there were gaps and it was necessary to give more prominence to this debate. In the section "Platforms, political communication and types of harmful discursive actions", we include reflections on how each of the types relates to the platforms. |
| Separate the RQs. Elaborate more on why the association between different types of discourse action being associated with each other matters | Reviewer C | We really appreciate this comment. In the section "Platforms, political communication and types of harmful discursive actions" we separated the RQs and hypotheses into those that were more analytical and those that were more exploratory. RQ1 and H1 were articulated from a debate on platform structures and harmful discourses. RQ2, RQ3, H2 and H3, on the other hand, were articulated from a debate on the far right and its public discourse strategies.We hope that the reviewer will be satisfied with the proposal. |
| Revise and maybe remove H3 | Reviewer C | The hypothesis was reviewed and articulated with the characteristics and uses of discursive types in the section "Platforms, political communication and types of harmful discursive actions". |
| Provide more details on how the selection of the corpus was made. For example, search in CT is usually made using keywords. Which specific keywords were used in this case? | Reviewer C | A list of search queries used in the article was inserted in the article as an appendix. |
| Highlight the contribution of the paper regarding the descriptive results and the impacts of different platforms | Reviewer C | This indication generated an adjustment highlighted in yellow in the introduction section of the new version of the manuscript. |
| Explain why readers should care about the association of different discursive types. Seem more like secondary analysis | Reviewer C | In the section "Platforms, political communication and types of harmful discursive actions", an argument is developed about how discursive types relate to the growth and institutionalization of the contemporary far right. The detailed study of the associations and uses of discursive types enhances our understanding of the far right in Brazil and the model presented can be used to diagnose the phenomenon in other contexts. |
| Nagelkerke's R² is not low, especially for social sciences.  However, the hypothesis claiming that "the explicitly enunciative variables are not able to solve all cases" should be rephrased | Reviewer C | This indication generated an adjustment highlighted in yellow in the new version of the manuscript. |
| The authors offer some interpretation of the data, which strengthens their argument. E.g. the last  paragraph on page 24 | Reviewer C | This indication generated an adjustment highlighted in yellow in the new version of the manuscript. |
| Revise and substantiate some excerpts of the conclusion. E.g. the findings do not present "an x-ray of what discursively attracts the attention of the (ultra)conservative audiences in Brazil", but they mostly show which kind of harmful political content circulates there | Reviewer C | The conclusion has been revised and the sentence indicated has been changed. A reflection has been inserted, based on the findings of the study, on conspiracy as the central axis of a long-term far-right project.  This indication generated an adjustment highlighted in yellow in the new version of the manuscript. |