

Paper: **“Sexual Violence in Italy: Are Women Victims or Responsible?”**

Submitted: 13 April 2023

Accepted: 25 May 2023

Published: 31 May 2023

Corresponding Author: Giuseppina Sacco

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n14p111

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Szabolcs Mátyás
University of Public Service, Hungary

Reviewer 2: Dosso Épouse Binaté Namodé Alice
Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly de Korhogo, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Penelope Anastasiadou
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece

Reviewer 4: Blinded

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!

Reviewer Name: Dr. Szabolcs Mátyás Ph.D.	
University/Country: University of Public Service / Hungary	
Date Manuscript Received: 17. 05. 23.	Date Review Report Submitted: 17. 05. 24.
Manuscript Title: Sexual violence: are women victims or responsible?	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	

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>Maybe it worths mentioning "Italy" in the title.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>It is ok.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>Grammatically perfect.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>It is clear but it should be explained in more details. The readers need more information about the methodology.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>It is ok.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>In the conclusions the authors should explain the connection between the regions and the results in more details.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>It is worth considering the use of not only Italian, but also other literature.</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):

If I were you, I would use a map instead of the Table 3. Most people don't know the Italian regions. A map would be more explanatory.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

None.

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!

Reviewer Name: Dr. PENELOPE ANASTASIADOU	
University/Country: ARISTOTLE UNIVERSITY OF THESSALONIKI/ GREECE	
Date Manuscript Received: MAY 16, 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: MAY 22, 2023
Manuscript Title: Sexual violence: are women victims or responsible?	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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.	4

<p>It could be improved. For instance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Social image of sexual violence : <i>Are women victims or responsible?</i> 2. Sexual violence and gender stereotypes: <i>Are women victims or responsible?</i> 	
<p>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</p>	<p>3</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. State clearly that your analysis was focused on the answers given only by the female population. 2. Provide at least five keywords . [See ESJ Author Guidelines] 	
<p>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>Check for Grammar and Spelling mistakes by Professional Foreign Language Specialist.</p>	
<p>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</p>	<p>2</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remove the seven “forms of sexual violence” from the introduction to the methodology section. 2. Remove the paragraph: «<i>The answer possibilities were: "I totally agree"</i>» from the introduction to the methodology section. 3. State the “Official permission” to use the Istat data [<i>if a permission is needed</i>] 4. Write the exact internet page, where a researcher could be able to find the initial Istat survey. <p>[Istat: http://dati-violenzadonne.istat.it/].</p>	
<p>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</p>	<p>2</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Separate the results [and the tables] from section 1 and 2 of the paper, to a <i>RESULTS</i> section. 2. Report in details the exact Istat internet source under the tables [1-4] . 	
<p>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>Write a few words about the [stereotype] findings of your [female] data analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Stereotypes based on age and educational qualification</i> • <i>Stereotypes by region.</i> 	
<p>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</p>	<p>2</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Instead of «Bibliography» write REFERENCES 2. Be sure to use the APA citation style in your paper. [See ESJ Author Guidelines]. FOR EXAMPLE THE FOLLOWING ARE NOT CORRECT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 16 . http://dati-violenzadonne.istat.it/ 17. http://www.istat.it/it/violenza-sulle-donne/la-prevenzione 	

3. Please, enrich your References with more-*up to date*- articles. [*Recommended at least 8 more articles*].

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)

1. Authors could enhance their paper with **international opinions** about sexual violence. [*What other researchers found about the topic*].
2. Authors could place the “seven forms of sexual violence” on a table.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only

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!

Reviewer Name: DOSSO épouse Binaté Namodé Alice	
University/Country: Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly de KORHOGO / CÔTE D'IVOIRE	
Date Manuscript Received: 16 mai 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 23 mai 2023
Manuscript Title: Sexual violence: are women victims or responsible? <i>Adriana Ostuni*</i> , <i>Giuseppina Sacco**</i> , <i>Pietro Sacco**</i> , <i>Alfonso Zizza**</i>	
<i>*Writer, social scientist</i> <i>**Department of Economics and Finance - University of Bari, Italy</i>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0467/23	
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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The summary is succinct, clear and precise.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Yes, it is.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> None	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> No, I suggest more. justify the methods used.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> There are enough clear.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
The conclusion needs to be better elaborated. Too many statements that seem personal.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Not enough scientific references.	

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):

Add more scientific references and verbatims. Very interesting subject. Think about the comparative study.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: