

Paper: “Gender Issues, Social Equity, and the Sustainable Management of Urban Transport Networks: An Italian Case Study”

Submitted: 13 June 2024

Accepted: 26 August 2024

Published: 31 August 2024

Corresponding Author: Elisabetta Venezia

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n23p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n23p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Barbara Trincone
University of Salerno, Italy

Reviewer 3: Josephine Gitome
Kenyatta University, Kenya

Reviewer 4: Salwa Alenat
Open University, Israel

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: 28/06/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 28/06/2024
Manuscript Title: 'Gender issues, social equity and the sustainable management of urban transport networks'	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0657/24	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
In my opinion the paper is well written	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
If there are some limitations on the study, these should also be added. Methodological part: is there any weakness of the proposed method?	

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.	3
In order to better emphasize policy insight of the paper, in my opinion conclusion section should include some links to the relevant literature.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):

Dear Author, the paper ‘Gender issues, social equity and the sustainable management of urban transport networks’ deals with an interesting topic and the results presented can be a useful source of information, for both theoreticians and practitioners dealing with transportation planning.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Barbara Trinconne	
University/Country: University of Salerno/Italy	
Date Manuscript Received: 27/06/2024	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Gender issues, social equity and the sustainable management of urban transport networks	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0657/24	
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.	5
<i>The title is consistent with the content expressed in the article</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>The abstract is quite clear and comprehensive with respect to the contents of the article</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Some minor formatting and English grammatical errors are present, so it is suggested to reread the article carefully</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4

<i>The study method is clear, it is only suggested that references to the statistical data sought (year of data and source) be included in the introduction</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The results are clear and useful to support local sustainable mobility policies</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusions are clear and accurate</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>the bibliographical references are quite sufficient, it is suggested to include only a few more up-to-date references than in section 2, Gender and Mobility, whose references stop in 2016.</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):

Suggestions are given in the individual Evaluation Criteria questions

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

No comments

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

This form is designed to summarize the peer review of the manuscript you have completed and 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 we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedures based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher, and the data can be used for research purposes.

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

Reviewer Name: Salwa Alinat-Abed	
University/Country: The Open University of Israel	
Date Manuscript Received: 3/7/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 20/7/2024
Manuscript Title: Gender issues, social equity and the sustainable management of urban transport networks	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the paper's author: Yes.	
If you approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper is available in the "review history" of the paper:	
If you approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:	

Evaluation Criteria:

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

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and adequate to the article's content.	4
The title is good, but I would suggest it be more focused. It can be formulated as follows: Social equity and the sustainable management of urban transport networks: Gallipoli area as a case study se insert your comments	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
<i>The abstract is OK. However, it is possible to refine the main conclusions and methodology.</i>	
3. This article has a few grammatical and spelling errors.	2
<i>The article must undergo strict linguistic editing. Much of it has cumbersome sentences.)</i>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
It is essential to separate the presentation of the research method, the research corpus, an explanation of the limitations or opportunities that existed during the research, and the study results. In the current version, all this material is found together under "Survey results and empirical findings on the WTP," <i>p. 4 of the article.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
The author presented interesting and important data relevant to the research topic, but I think they are insufficient to conclude them. Therefore, it is highly recommended to add more data from the field and organize them under more focused parameters such as: Characterization of the research population: women, elderly, drivers, tourists, and more. Or different needs of the users regarding transportation, limitations, employment opportunities, accessibility, and more.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
The summary is partial and does not reflect the goals of the research. Also, the summary does not explain the three parameters on which the article is based: "Gender issues, social equity, and the sustainable management of urban transport networks." That is why it is essential to rewrite the summary after significantly improving the theoretical background, the presentation of the data, and their analysis.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>The bibliography list is exemplary and up-to-date, but it lacks sources explaining the relationship between gender and public transportation in Turkey or elsewhere.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted; no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted. Minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The article deals with an important and exciting topic. This is what the author wrote in the introduction: The paper "considers different aspects, having as an objective the satisfaction of transport and environmental knowledge needs with particular regard to Gallipoli. The aim is to supply policy indications in the light of a specific population cluster, women, economic operators, and stakeholder exigencies. The paper contains transport and environmental analyses referring to the Gallipoli area, while results stemming from a consultation process of transport operators, citizens, namely women, tourists, public employees, and stakeholders, are presented". (p. 1)

But throughout the article, you can find several points that need to be improved so that the article is worthy of academic publication:

1. We need to review the research literature on the topic being studied in Turkey and check what has been published elsewhere.
2. One should take care of references to the bibliography in the body of the article and specify the pages there.

3. In an article that lacks questions that guide the discussion and conclusions, it is appropriate to formulate them and present them in a focused and matter-of-fact manner in the introduction.
4. The methodological chapter should be improved according to the recommendations in the form.
5. The analysis of the findings should be rewritten and refined in it analyzed criteria.
6. The summary should be rewritten using the literary background and findings.
7. Add another bibliography analyzing the relationship between transportation and gender and society issues.