**Cover Letter:**

Attached bellow explanation for the corrections made according to editors remarks:

1) The word offender is included in the manuscript. Please omit and use person first language. Also remove the word prisoner and include incarcerated person.

**Authors’ Response:** We deleted and changed the terminology.

2) In the introduction, there is no need to define recidivism.
**Authors’ Response:** We deleted the definition.

3) The authors mention the word girls in the introduction.  I am assuming that only adults were included in the study. If so, please remove references to delinquency and girls.
**Authors’ Response:** Done

4) The introduction doesn't capture the extant work on gendered pathways to prison. The introduction is very brief and doesn't include information on the study or the broad research questions. It is essential that the goals of the study be noted in the introduction. I would look at other articles in CJB for more information on how to better prepare an introduction. It should be a roadmap for the analysis/study.

**Authors’ Response:** We rewrote and expanded the introduction. Now it is much more continuously and logically arranged for fully understanding the research questions.

In addition, it might be best to include information on the prison in the methods section (and comparison to US prisons).
**Authors’ Response:** At your request we have moved this part to the method. However, it seems to us that it is less related to this part and was much appropriate to leave it at the beginning of the introduction

5) Bulleted lists remain in the document.  Please remove.
**Authors’ Response:** Bulleted/numbered list removed

6) Would it be best to describe the procedure before providing information on participants?
**Authors’ Response:** According to the APA, sub-chapter "procedure" is the third in order after participants and tools therefore this chapter was presented in this way. However, your comment was correct, and we passed part of the procedure to give a participant chapter to make it more understandable but the description of the stages of data collection remained at the end of the method.

7) Table 2 should be merged with Table 1 or the table should be removed. In addition, tables must be placed on separate pages.
**Authors’ Response:** Corrected according to the remark.

8) Tables 3,4,5, 6 could be merged or the information provided in the text. The small tables do not meet the criterion for APA format, and each table must be on one page.

**Authors’ Response:** We merged tables 3, 4 and 5. Instead of 7 tables we now have 4.

9) The same concern is raised with table 6 and 7. Each table should be on one page. It may be best to merge them in some way or to simply provide some of this information in the text. Given that this is a qualitative paper, not every finding needs to be quantified in some way.
**Authors’ Response:** We merged tables 3, 4 and 5. Instead of 7 tables we now have 4. To be more understandable we decided to remain tables 6 and 7 separate .

10) there is another bulleted/numbered list in the findings

**Authors’ Response:** We removed all bulleted/numbered list

11) The first sentence of the discussion is not clear.  In addition, the authors use the word figure in the discussion - this is a qualitative piece and there is no need to fully quantify the findings or discuss the results in this way.  Instead, I would describe the themes that emerged in the work.
 The second paragraph of the discussion is also unclear. The authors describe the findings on the physical and sexual abuse. The authors then go on to discuss men. I would instead discuss the implications of this work. The pathways literature doesn't suggest that sexual assault isn't the only way women are involved in crime. Instead, the research in this area suggests that women respond to sexual assault in a different way.
 There is only one key finding highlighted in the discussion. Instead it might be helpful to highlight some unique themes. It seems like the results speak to gender responsive work in this area - it might be helpful to highlight this in terms of a policy suggestion.
**Authors’ Response:** We rewrote the discussion, addressing issues that arose from the analysis of the narratives.

14) A small point, but please make sure the references have a DOI and that it is the correct format. There should be <https://doi.org/>
 Please review all references - in text and in the references sheet - to make sure they are in APA 7 format.

**Authors’ Response:** We review all references and corrected according to APA 7 format.