Dear Editors,

Thank you and the associate editor Dr. Beth Huebner for the opportunity to revise our manuscript again. We revised our manuscript in accordance with all the comments with the goal of the article now meeting your journal’s requirements and hoping that now it will be suitable for publication.

Below please find our explanations of the changes we made.

**Associate Editor remarks:**

**Comment 1:**

First, please remove all bulleted lists from the manuscript.

Authors’ Response:Done

**Comment 2:**

Second, please consider revising the literature review.  The literature review is relatively dated and omits many important recent pieces of work on female imprisonment and offending. Some of this literature is mentioned in the discussion, so it is not clear why it is not mentioned in the front half of the work. Also, please do not summarize articles one by one in the literature review and instead describes themes that have emerged in the work. In addition, the authors do not provide ample context on the study prison. For those readers outside of Israel, it would be helpful to have more context. Finally, several formatting issues should be addressed.

Authors’ Response: We rewrite our literature using more dated references and wrote it more fluently. In addition, we added explanation about Israeli prison system and characteristics about women in Israeli prison compared to the United States prison system and rates.

**Comment 3:**

The page limit for articles in CJB is 35 pages. I will extend the page limit to 38 pages, which means that substantial editing is needed. In addition, please use person first language and omit references to prisoners, inmates, and offenders.  Women in prison is appropriate.  A small point.  Please denote grounded theory - not ground theory.

Authors’ Response: We changed all content according to comments

**Reviewer num. 1**

**Comment 1**

On pages 5-6 of 43, the author(s) write “Understanding this pattern may contribute to the development of more appropriate treatment programs for female offenders, based not only on their criminal patterns and sense of victimization but also on their subjective perceptions regarding their degree of personal responsibility for their criminal lifestyles and the offenses for which they were convicted.”

Given the practical nature of CJB, it would be important for the author(s) at this point to highlight how these assumptions about female criminality have practical implications. If one feels personally responsible and their motives are offender centered, then programs such as cognitive behavioral therapy and moral reconation therapy are appropriate. If it is the victimization that is driving criminal behavior, then more feminist centered therapies such as Helping Women Recover are appropriate. If it is a combination of both, then a blended program such as Moving On might be most appropriate. The author(s) reference these approaches on pages 24-25 of 43. As a reader, it would be better to have that material in the Literature Review rather than in the Discussion, and then in the Discussion really highlight how the current findings intersect with this debate.

Authors’ Response: We have rewritten the literature review to be more focused and up-to-date. At the same time, it is important to emphasize that the focus of the study is to offer alternative explanation for the emergence of criminal life among women and not the treatment of these women. Hence, we did refer to the discussion on the topic of treatment but as an emphasis on its suitability for the research findings.

**Comment 2**

In my previous review, I wrote “Also, the author(s) should note how this sample may differ or be similar to other samples from United States, since many of the studies cited in the literature review utilize data from samples in the United States.” The author(s) included this section in the manuscript “Female prisoners in Israel and the United States tend to have been convicted of similar offenses (drug and violence), are older than the male prisoner population, and have shorter sentences than men.” Please include citations and specific data to ‘back up’ these statements. From my reading of the literature most incarcerated females are convicted of drug and property crimes, with slightly fewer being convicted of violent crimes.

Authors’ Response: The conviction rates and female prisoner's characteristic in U.S are differed by state prisons, federal and local jails. In Israel we have only state prisons, so we compare between these two prisons. As the data shows women in state prisons in U.S similar to female prisoners in Israel are more likely than men have been convicted for drug or property offenses yet violent offenses (e.g. murder, sexual assault or robbery) remains the main offense for both genders (Carson, 2020; Kajstura, 2019). We added this explanation in p.7.

**Comment 3**

In my previous review I wrote, “Finally, did the sample differ from the population (of sentenced offenders) in terms of demographic characteristics and offense types?” This question was posed to the author(s) because it’s important to show that your sample is representative of your population. Please address this comment in this review.

Authors’ Response: We added explanation on pp.7-8 that the sample in this research was similar to general female offenders' population.

**Comment 4**

On page 13 of 43, the author(s) write “This category was more common among those who began their criminal life delinquents as minors (60%) than among adult delinquents (15%).” In Table 5 it shows that 66.7% of juvenile offenders endorsed this attitude towards their delinquent life course versus 33.3% of adult offenders. Please rectify the discrepancy between these two figures (15% vs. 33.3%). Did the 15% statistic derived from the 9 individuals who endorsed this attitude?

Authors’ Response: This is a print mistake. The percentage are as shown in table 5: 66.7% vs 33.3%. We modify the numbers as you can see on p.13.

**Comment 5**

The Discussion was difficult to follow as there was a lot of new literature reviewed and the findings that were highlighted did not seem to be the key takeaways from the Results section (For ex: “These participants, as well as young participants (aged 18-30), described themselves as acting proactively and assertively, including choosing a career, choosing a partner, and even knowingly entering the criminal world.”—these results seem to pertain to the age of the offender at the time of the offense they were convicted of, while the results seem to point to the age of onset of one’s criminal career). As a reader, it seems like two different people wrote the Results and Discussion given the disjointed nature of those sections

Authors’ Response:We made the necessary adjustment to so that the discussion will be a direct continuation of the findings and will present a broad interpretation of them. (p.21 – 25)