

# The Changing Meaning Of “No” In

## Canadian Sex Work PONE-D-23-33995R1

Dear Dr. Kennedy,

We're pleased to inform you that your manuscript has been judged scientifically suitable for publication and will be formally accepted for publication once it meets all outstanding technical requirements.

Within one week, you'll receive an e-mail detailing the required amendments. When these have been addressed, you'll receive a formal acceptance letter and your manuscript will be scheduled for publication.

An invoice will be generated when your article is formally accepted. Please note, if your institution has a publishing partnership with PLOS and your article meets the relevant criteria, all or part of your publication costs will be covered. Please make sure your user information is up-to-date by logging into Editorial Manager at <http://www.editorialmanager.com/pone/> and clicking the 'Update My Information' link at the top of the page. If you have any questions relating to publication charges, please contact our Author Billing department directly at [authorbilling@plos.org](mailto:authorbilling@plos.org).

If your institution or institutions have a press office, please notify them about your upcoming paper to help maximize its impact. If they'll be preparing press materials, please inform our press team as soon as possible -- no later than 48 hours after receiving the formal acceptance. Your manuscript will remain under strict press embargo until 2 pm Eastern Time on the date of publication. For more information, please contact [onepress@plos.org](mailto:onepress@plos.org).

Kind regards,

Emily Lund

Academic Editor

PLOS ONE

Additional Editor Comments (optional):

I have reviewed the revisions and, in agreement with Reviewer 2 and in contrast with Reviewer1, I believe that the authors have adequately addressed the previous reviewer comments.

**Reviewers' comments:**

Reviewer's Responses to Questions

## Comments to the Author

1. If the authors have adequately addressed your comments raised in a previous round of review and you feel that this manuscript is now acceptable for publication, you may indicate that here to bypass the “Comments to the Author” section, enter your conflict of interest statement in the “Confidential to Editor” section, and submit your "Accept" recommendation.

Reviewer #1: (No Response)

Reviewer #2: All comments have been addressed

---

2. Is the manuscript technically sound, and do the data support the conclusions?

The manuscript must describe a technically sound piece of scientific research with data that supports the conclusions. Experiments must have been conducted rigorously, with appropriate controls, replication, and sample sizes. The conclusions must be drawn appropriately based on the data presented.

Reviewer #1: Yes

Reviewer #2: Yes

---

3. Has the statistical analysis been performed appropriately and rigorously?

Reviewer #1: Yes

Reviewer #2: Yes

---

4. Have the authors made all data underlying the findings in their manuscript fully available?

The [PLOS Data policy](#) requires authors to make all data underlying the findings described in their manuscript fully available without restriction, with rare exception (please refer to the Data Availability Statement in the manuscript PDF file). The data should be provided as part of the manuscript or its supporting information, or deposited to a public repository. For example, in addition to summary statistics, the data points behind means, medians and variance measures should be available. If there are restrictions on publicly sharing data—e.g. participant privacy or use of data from a third party—those must be specified.

Reviewer #1: Yes

Reviewer #2: Yes

---

5. Is the manuscript presented in an intelligible fashion and written in standard English?

PLOS ONE does not copyedit accepted manuscripts, so the language in submitted articles must be clear, correct, and unambiguous. Any typographical or grammatical errors should be corrected at revision, so please note any specific errors here.

Reviewer #1: Yes

Reviewer #2: Yes

---

## 6. Review Comments to the Author

Please use the space provided to explain your answers to the questions above. You may also include additional comments for the author, including concerns about dual publication, research ethics, or publication ethics. (Please upload your review as an attachment if it exceeds 20,000 characters)

**[I do not think this reviewer was reading the right version of the manuscript as there is no reference to #MeToo in the text currently and there is now a “Historical context and safety” section in the introduction.]**

Reviewer #1: Dear author,

I appreciate the opportunity to re-review the manuscript. My most significant feedback in my

initial thorough review was that this manuscript was lacking in contextual information about the legislative setting in Canada with regard to sex work criminalization and how this impacts communications and advertising. This feedback was also echoed by other reviewers, and your response mentions adding this background information, but I don't see it and don't feel that this feedback was adequately taken into account. Instead of introducing the reader to your subject, the Canadian setting, and the need for your study, the introduction now immediately describes 'Research at Scale' and 'Limits and Safety', the importance of which are unclear because the subject matter of the article is not adequately introduced. There is virtually no information about the context of sex work in Canada. PLOS One publishes for a general, non-specialized audience, and this manuscript requires far more background information for an audience not familiar with sex work. I appreciate the clarification regarding the Methods, but the Results section continues to be extremely long and meandering. This manuscript would be much stronger with a more robust background section and a more limited objective and results section. Another reviewer mentioned that linking MeToo to this research was an overreach, you stated that you had removed the reference, but the reference remains in the manuscript. I don't believe that the updated manuscript adequately reflects the thoughtful and extensive feedback that reviewers shared, and as a result, I don't believe it's ready for publication.

Reviewer #2: This article is much improved with a close reading of the reviewers comments and a refocus in how the data and conclusions are presented.

---

7. PLOS authors have the option to publish the peer review history of their article ([what does this mean?](#)). If published, this will include your full peer review and any attached files.

If you choose “no”, your identity will remain anonymous but your review may still be made public.

**Do you want your identity to be public for this peer review?** For information about this choice, including consent withdrawal, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Reviewer #1: No

Reviewer #2: No