

**Paper: “The Last Lick: A Lived Experience of Non-incarcerated Partners”**

**Submitted: 17 February 2023**

**Accepted: 16 March 2023**

**Published: 31 March 2023**

Corresponding Author: Christian Matthew

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n8p129](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n8p129)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Don Martin  
Youngstown State University, USA

Reviewer 3: Raúl Rocha Romero  
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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!*

Date Manuscript Received: 24 <sup>th</sup> Feb 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 7 <sup>th</sup> March 2024
Manuscript Title: The Last Lick: A Lived Experience of Non-incarcerated Partners	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>No</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	

## 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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>

<p>I suggest that the authors clarify the phrase “The incarceration of their partners has a profound effect on them and affects them differently from other family members. Who are them? I suppose the authors mean “ the incarceration of their partners has a profound effect on non-incarcerated ones”</p>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p>I suggest that the authors offer a better explanation of the emotional categories. As a very complicated subject, emotions’ definitions are very tricky and, in my opinion, this can be at least minimized if using some sort of definition</p>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p>As a result of the previous item, results could be improved by a correct categorization. For example,          ...irritating. Irreversible regrets. My grief is not easily forgotten. My marriage hopes were cut short and shattered... " (Participant 02).          why is this example here (Frustration) and not under “Anger”?</p>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):**

**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: DR DON MARTIN	
University/Country: USA	
Date Manuscript Received: 3/12/23	Date Review Report Submitted: 3/12/23
Manuscript Title: THE LAST LICK	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 58-02-2023	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:    YeXs/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: YeXs/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: YXes/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>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>I think it could have a better title. It's a bit vague. I would use something simple like "the impact of incarceration on the family: an examination of affect."</i>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>I would look through the paper again and look at your transition paragraphs.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Qualitative research is not my strength. I am a quantitative researcher. I think the results make sense but I would not be the best judge.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Having been a forensic psychologist and consulted with prisons, the research makes sense,</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>This is probably the weakest part of the paper. I think a reader would like some solutions to this problem. For example, what programs would you start? If you did marital counseling in prison, how would you structure it? How would you train staff more accommodating? What programs would you create for the inmates and their feelings related to this difficulty? So there are number of things you could discuss</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Actually the references were good and up-to-date. The international Journal of offender counseling has a nice article which I think could help with some ideas as well as references. <a href="https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0306624X17721525">https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0306624X17721525</a></i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

I knew Satir and I actually reviewed a book about her for one of the journals. She is much more of a family therapist than a couple therapist. I think the prison environment could provide couple therapy but is unlikely to provide family therapy. Virginia was certainly an affective therapist and in that sense she fits the manuscript. But there are more recent therapist like Sue Johnson and emotion focused therapy and probably have a stronger place in your work.

For example, you mentioned Virginia as a model in the beginning of the paper, but there is really no follow-through. It's not like you use her model or the way that she

does therapy in your discussion or as a model that you would use to help these families. You simply use her model to discuss feelings in the context of families. But lots of authors have discussed these feelings among incarcerated individuals. Almost everyone in these families feels anger, sadness, hurt, betrayal etc. I like Virginia's model but I'm not clear on how it pertains to your paper. So if you're going to use her model or Sue Johnson's, I would incorporate the model throughout the paper particularly in your discussion section.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

**I like the paper. It covers a valuable topic and the references are up-to-date. I think the authors need to provide some solutions or at least some ways that could help these prisoners and their partners. In a way, they are stating the obvious that prisoners and their families are unhappy. In the United States, we imprison more individuals than anyone in the world and many of them are black men. So a lot of what they talk about in the paper is evident in the United States. I think the unique part of the paper is that they talked to the non incarcerated partners and examined their feelings. I think if they spend some time and strengthen this paper, it will be well received and read.**

# 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: Raúl Rocha Romero	
University/Country: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México	
Date Manuscript Received: 12/03/23	Date Review Report Submitted: 19/03/23
Manuscript Title: The Last Lick: A Lived Experience of Non-Incarcerated Partners	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 28.02.2023	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The title is appropriate.</i>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>the abstract is ok, but it is somewhat confusing.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The text is very well written.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The methodology is well structured and detailed.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The results are good, but one as a reader would expect the authors to incorporate more expressions from the study participants.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The discussion is very good, as it collects and discusses the results of the study. (Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>It is evident that there is an exhaustive bibliographical investigation, but perhaps there are too many references for a short text. Furthermore, there are many references that are not cited in the text and vice versa.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Present the references correctly. Perhaps it would be convenient to eliminate those that are redundant.

On the other hand, perhaps the results can be expanded a little more.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

**The study is very good from the theoretical and methodological perspective used by the authors. Perhaps it is convenient to reduce the number of references, because they cover almost the same number of pages as the text itself.**