

Paper: “Internet as a Meeting Place for Spouses: Homogamy, Assortative Mating and Online Dating in Contemporary Italy”

Submitted: 05 November 2022

Accepted: 13 January 2023

Published: 31 January 2023

Corresponding Author: Laura Arosio

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n2p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n2p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Mary Hollingsworth
University of West Alabama, United States

Reviewer 2: Luan Bekteshi
Barleti University, Tirana, Albania

Reviewer 3: Enriko Ceko
Canadian Institute of Technology, Albania

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: Enriko Ceko	
University/Country: Canadian Institute of Technology, Albania	
Date Manuscript Received: 2 nd January 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 4 th January 2023
Manuscript Title: Internet as a meeting place for spouses: Online dating, homogamy and assortative mating in contemporary Italy	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1167/22	
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.	2
<i>The title can be improved... for example:</i>	

<i>Internet as a meeting place for marriage: Homogamy and assortative mating on dating online in contemporary Italy.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods, and results.	1
<p><i>The abstract doesn't clearly present objects, methods, and results.</i></p> <p><i>The abstract should include:</i></p> <p><i>Purpose</i> <i>Design/methodology/approach</i> <i>Findings</i> <i>Research limitations/implications</i> <i>Practical implications</i> <i>Originality/value</i> <i>Practical value</i> <i>Keywords:</i> <i>Article Type: (Research paper)</i></p>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<p><i>There are some grammatical errors, a check by a professional is recommended, as well as using google English checking platforms too.</i></p>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<p><i>The study methods are explained clearly, but the author should include some data about the usage of the internet from Italian adults, territorial coverage of the internet in Italy, etc., like this between two periods taken into the question of the research (2000 – 2010, and 2010 – 2016).</i></p> <p><i>Data for handling the research have been taken from Italian statistics. The author should explain that this doesn't violate any local law on data usage and/or any declaration from Istat, these data can be used for research purposes (which usually appears in national annual statistical books), should be used at the end of the paper, after literature.</i></p>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<p><i>The results are clear and do not contain errors, but the author should find some more space to compare the results with other research, which in fact there are mentioned in the literature, but the comparison of them with the Italian situation in the results part of the research is missing.</i></p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<p><i>The conclusions are accurate but more general than specified. Some more insight is needed, as well as some recommendations too.</i></p>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<p><i>The references are comprehensive, but the author should take care with the literature because some literature, listed at the end of the article is missing from the text. For example, Reference No 72.</i></p> <p><i>The reference for Istat in the literature is the year 2021, while the paper is 2016.</i></p>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: Luan Bekteshi	
University/Country: Barleti University, Tirana, Albania	
Date Manuscript Received: 03 January 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 10 January 2023
Manuscript Title: Internet as a meeting place for spouses: Online dating, homogamy and assortative mating in contemporary Italy	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1167/22	
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>The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of article</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The abstract clearly presents object, method and results.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>The article is well-written. English level of this article is alright.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The study methods are explained clearly</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The results are clear and do not contain errors.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusions are supported by the content.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The references are comprehensive.</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):

I think that there is a need to be reduced the list of references and select those that are from recent periods of time and not from periods when the Internet had a limited use by the population.

It would be better if the references were not scattered throughout the paragraphs of the article but were summarized in the introduction section of the article. If the purpose of the article is to prove or disprove the hypothesis of another author, it could also be included in the conclusions section.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Accept the article and publish with revisions. The paper would benefit from changes.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: Mary Ann Hollingsworth	
University/Country: University of West Alabama, United States	
Date Manuscript Received: December 20, 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: December 21, 2022
Manuscript Title: Internet as a meeting place for spouses: Online dating, homogamy and assortative mating in contemporary Italy	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 20-67-11-20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes /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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<i>The title does accurately represent the content of the manuscript.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>The abstract does clearly summarize the objects, methods, and results of the study.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>The abstract has multiple paragraphs versus the usual one paragraph. Revision might be needed to align with the journal protocol.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>There is some description of data analysis in the results section that should be included in the methods section – bottom of page 5.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The content of the results are clearly presented. Clear column headings are needed for all columns in tables 2 and 3.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The Conclusion provides a clear summary of the study and indicates further study is needed on the topic.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The references do provide thorough and appropriate support for the study.</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): This is a very well-written presentation of this study. Please see the comments in numbers 3, 4, and 5 for some minor revisions to make.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: With the revisions suggested above, this seems to be a well-written manuscript on the study and would be a good inclusion for publication.