

Paper: “Is There a Gender Imbalance in the Italian Labor Market?”

Submitted: 02 September 2021

Accepted: 26 October 2021

Published: 31 October 2021

Corresponding Author: Giuseppina Sacco

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n36p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Thaweesakdhi Suvagondha
Thammasat Business School, Thammasat University, Thailand

Reviewer 3: Francesco D. d'Ovidio
University of Bari “Aldo Moro”, Italy

Reviewer 4: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Thaweesakdhi Suvagondha	
University/Country: Thammasat Business School, Thammasat University, Thailand	
Date Manuscript Received: September 7, 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: September 12, 2021
Manuscript Title: Is There A Gender Imbalance in the Italian Labour Market?	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 09.48.21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4

<i>Names and the titles of the authors should be changed into the following format, Assistant Professor Guiseppina Sacco, Assistant Professor Pietro Sacco, and Assistant Professor Alfonso Zigga, Faculty of Economic and Finance, University of Bari, Italy</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Almost no mistake, but should be sent to an expert for a final approval.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Every reference should be indicated after the quote. For example,....(McKinsey 2015)...</i> <i>Where's the quote of Baranzini?</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Please insert the reference after each quoted sentence.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Francesco D. d'Ovidio	
University/Country: University of Bari "Aldo Moro" (Italy)	
Date Manuscript Received: 6 sept 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 15 sept 2021
Manuscript Title: IS THERE A GENDER IMBALANCE IN THE ITALIAN LABOUR MARKET?	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0948/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/ <input type="checkbox"/> No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/ <input type="checkbox"/> No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/ <input type="checkbox"/> No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i>
	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>I believe that the title is very adequate to the content, and stimulant for reader</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The abstract includes sufficient information to define the paper's focus; some improvements need (see attached file)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>I am not a native English speaker, but I have identified some complex paragraphs or sentences with inadequate technical terms (eg "number" for "size" of populations). Other problems may be present: please check</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Study methodologies are clear. Data sources are very concisely described: greater clarity would be desirable. The time interval of the study must be explained clearly</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The results are clear, assuming that Authors previously explained the time limits of the used data.</i> <i>I do not understand why tables and figures are so much small (and difficult to read) respect the text: especially the figures, which lose so much clarity when printed (and should be named "Figure 1", "Figure 2", "Figure 3", not "Chart").</i> <i>Table titles are not standardized: title "Table n" sometimes becomes "Tab. n": please standardize.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Conclusions resume adequately the study frame and its results, deepening the social consequences of the findings</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>Most of the titles shown were not cited in the paper, and are therefore useless (and according to the standards of scientific publishing they must be removed). The rest should be standardized in their format.</i> <i>If any title is considered indispensable by the Authors, it should be cited in the appropriate part of the paper</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	x
Return for major revision and resubmission	

Reject	
--------	--

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Refine text and, moreover, references. See Attached file.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I hope that the revisions that I have requested of the Authors do not create problems for the publication of the paper: in particular, the request to make the tables and especially the figures more readable, which could lead to an excessive development of pages.