**Student Mentors of Prisoners: Contribution of a Mentoring Program for Prisoners – Summary of Corrections**

We thank the editor and reviewers for the time spent reviewing our manuscript and for their insightful comments and suggestions for improving the manuscript.

We are grateful for the opportunity to revise and resubmit our work. We have attempted to address all critiques, recommendations, and suggestions, and believe that, as a result, the current revised manuscript is an improved product that will be more suitable for an international audience. We therefore hope it will meet with your approval.

In accordance with the instructions to authors, we have provided point-by-point responses regarding changes made, as well as a detailed response to critiques and requested revisions with which we respectfully took issue..

Below is a list of detailed revisions made in response to the reviewers’ comments and suggestions.

**Reviewer 1

*Comment 1***

There needs to be an inclusion of the researcher’s positionality in relation to the mentoring programme/prison service. For example is the researcher a psychologist or a criminologist? This context was lacking and I would like to have understood more fully about the researcher.

*Response*

We responded to the reviewer’s request for more context regarding our positionality by including a paragraph on page…, paragraph….

­

***Comment 2***

There needs to be a focus around desistance also as there is no reference in the paper to how mentoring programmes can support the desistance process. There is some excellent research from the UK on the impact of (peer) mentoring programmes and how they support desistance, identity transition and personal agency.

*Response*

We thank the reviewer for this helpful comment. We have added references to the theory in the article. See pages ……

***Comment 3***

In the abstract, the author refers to both inmates and prisoners, so a consistency in terminology is needed throughout.

*Response*

We have made the necessary corrections, opting for *prisoners* throughout.

***Comment 4***

What does the prison mentoring programme entail?

*Response*

We thank the reviewer for this helpful comment. We added a section describing the present prison mentoring programme. See page….

***Comment 5***

How are the students equipped to facilitate these activities. For example, how old are the students? And what life experience do they bring to the sessions?

*Response*

You can now find this information in the section describing the programme. See page…, paragraph…..

***Comment 6***

What issues might the students face in terms of conditioning, grooming, violence and how are they vetted for their suitability (or is acceptance on to the degree course the benchmark of suitability?).

*Response*

We added this information in the section describing the programme. See page…, paragraph…..

***Comment 7***

I think it is important to consider that during times of austerity in the prison service, ‘free’ services like mentoring could be seen as doing the work of prison staff? Maybe a section to demonstrate how these dynamics play out in the Israel context.

*Response*
To the best of our knowledge, the role of the students was confined to mentoring and they did not do the work of the prison staff.

***Comment 8***
The author addresses many of the limitations of the study on page 15, including the lack of negative experiences reported and identifies that with such a small sample size the findings are not representative. There are assumptions made throughout of the longevity of the programme once the prisoners are released but there is a lack of evidence to support this (and therefore longitudinal work is needed to support this claim).

*Response*
We thank the reviewer for this helpful comment. This limitation and a suggestion for further research were added to the text. See page…, paragraph….

***Comment 9***

The findings suggest that the student mentors are ‘not authority figures’ and therefore trust is high. Could the author say more about prison staff-prisoner relationships around power, trust, legitimacy etc to set the context? Page 3, 57-60 explores the issues with coming in to prison.

*Response*

We thank the reviewer for your comment but we are of the opinion that this is not necessary. To the best of our knowledge, despite the authority wielded by the prison staff, relations between them and the prisoners are good.

***Comment 10***

Could the ‘pains of imprisonment’ be included to draw out Nugent and Schinkle’s work further? Mention of Crewe’s work on page 13 could have been presented earlier.

*Response*

We have added a reference to this aspect in the literature review. See page …

***Comment 11***

Subheadings would help to delineate the sections for example on page 4 the author talks about different theories - Balagan (mess) theory and also positive criminology/reintegrative shaming. These are excellent theories to draw upon but subheadings will direct the reader more clearly. Some excellent concepts around reintegrative shaming and how rehabilitation and reintegration are possible.

*Response*

We have included relevant subheadings to the paper to facilitate reading.

***Comment 12***

Again links to desistance are needed in this section on page 4/5.

*Response*

As stated above, references to desistance theory is presented in the article. See pages ….

***Comment 13***

The method section I feel needs to include researcher positionality. Who are they and what is their connection to the research project?

*Response*

As mentioned above in our response to Reviewer 1, Comment 1, we have included this information in the Introduction. See page…, paragraph….

***Comment 14***

They identify in-depth interviews suggesting qualitative principles, but then page 5 58 – page 6 5 suggest questionnaires, which is confusing. The section around data analysis could be made clearer.

*Response*

Thank you for this commentWe have modified the section (see page…paragraph…) and trust it is now clear.

***Comment 15***

What does the author mean by “integrated and differentiated? “ (pg 6 46 – 48).

*Response*

We removed this from the paper to avoid unnecessary confusion.

***Comment 16***

Could there be a bridging section to provide an overview of the themes for the reader, before going straight into the findings section?

*Response*
A bridging section that provides an overview of the themes was added. See page 8 paragraph 5.

***Comment 17***
The findings were really interesting and insightful around the positive impacts of the programme for the prisoners. There were quite a lot of themes going on and a lot of data presented. Could the author have drawn upon the theories/concepts earlier (eg positive criminology) to explain the significance of these findings?

*Response*

We have added theoretical references in the literature review included in the Introduction with findings linked to the relevant literature.

***Comment 18***Some sections were quite superficial and lacked academic depth (eg page 8 17/18) the ‘painful experience of imprisonment. Could Syke’s (1958 study on the pains of imprisonment help to understand this?

*Response*

We have added references to the relevant sources on the pains of imprisonment. See page…. paragraph….

***Comment 19***

Page 8 48 “they taught us how to control our temper”. I would like to understand how these dynamic work.

*Response*

In the course of mentoring, the mentors conveyed messages to some of the prisoners relating to tolerance and anger control, both verbally and as living examples.

***Comment 20***

So to summarise, a greater critical discussion of the significance of these findings (maybe in relation to desistance for example) would make this read less like just a selection of quotes/short sections. Themes are extremely relevant however, around Social capital for example (see Farrall 2004).

*Response*
The Discussion and Conclusions have been reorganized to include a reference to the contribution of mentoring to desistance from crime. See page ….., paragraph ….

***Comment 21***

Page 11 (10) what does it mean “the experiment with social pressure affected me?”

*Response*

An explanation has been added. See page …, paragraph….

 ***Comment 22***

In the discussion section, the author introduces new concepts. Page 13 (7) how do we know that students are “representatives of normative society?” Is this taken for granted?

*Response*

We have added content to clarify the fact that the mentors represent normative society. For example, one of the conditions for their acceptance was a crime-free past. We also stated that they were non-peer mentors.

***Comment 23***

On page 8 the author introduces the theme of ‘discretion’ and cognitive behavioural elements, which need to be included earlier for them to make sense.

*Response*

We thank the reviewer for this comment but deem it appropriate to leave the organisation it is now.

***Comment 24***

Was participation in the mentoring programme (for the prisoners) in any way linked to sentence planning/release prospects?

*Response*

Participation in the mentoring programme is not linked as suggested. However, the Release Committee does receive an expert opinion on the prisoner's general conduct in prison, and participation in the programme is the outcome of the overall impression gained on the prisoner's positive functioning.

***Comment 25***
Page 14/15 the author refers to anomic state (is think linked to Merton’s concept of anomie?) and also the inclusion of Hirschi’s social bonds theory is confusing and needs to be included sooner.

 *Response*

To avoid confusion, we have changed the content to refer to a “confused state” rather than an “anomic state”.

***Comment 26***

The discussion chapter is long I would suggest a rewrite to include the discussion with findings and then a strong, sharp conclusion to summarise the key points.

*Response*

As per the reviewer's suggestion, we have restructured and reorganized the Discussion and Conclusions to tie in more closely with our Findings section. Where appropriate and necessary, we have also elaborated on the discussion. We chose to use both the Findings and Discussion and Conclusions sections as we wanted to provide more focused explanations and a summary of the actual findings in a clearer and more easily “digestible” manner, i.e. discussing the lessons learned from the interviews and data that emerged from them while connecting with previous studies cited in the literature review. In this regard, we wanted to make the Literature Review come full circle in the Discussion and Conclusions section.

**Reviewer 2

*Comment 1***

The author is conflating rehabilitation programming and meditation classes as mentoring programs.

*Response*

We deleted the paragraph describing meditation classes.

***Comment 2***
There is no clear definition of mentoring programs stated.

*Response*

We added a definition. See page…, paragraph….

***Comment 3***

Overall concepts such as mental well-being, self-image etc.. are not defined or reviewed adequately.

*Response*

We decided to delete these concepts for the sake of clarity.

***Comment 4***

The stated number of mentoring sessions within the introduction equates to an (n =1120) (40 mentors over 28 weeks at once a week). Within the methodology participants are stated as an n=21. It is not clear how many sessions were used for interview data.

*Response*
There were about 56 mentoring hours for each prisoner. This has been added to the text – see page …, paragraph ….

***Comment 5***

Prison social workers determined the interview population (selection bias).

*Response*

We thank the reviewer for this helpful comment. A discussion of this possible bias was added to the text. See page…., paragraph ….

***Comment 6***

There is a limited explanation of methodology in regard to semi-structured interviews. It is not clear what the semi-structural questions were.

*Response*

Reference to this was added to the text. See page…

***Comment 7***
It appears a thematic analysis was done on the interviews by an outside party 'expert peer reviewers' yet this methodology is not clear and there is no discussion of validity, reliability or theme construction.

Response:

We have added a clarification regarding thematic analysis. See page …., paragraph ….

We trust that our responses, presented above, and revisions incorporated in the manuscript address all the concerns raised by the reviewers, making our manuscript more suitable for publication in your journal.

Once again, we are grateful for your consideration and for the opportunity to revise the manuscript.

We look forward to hearing from you regarding further steps.

Respectfully,