Jun-2021  
  
Dear Dr. Peled-Laskov,  
  
Manuscript ID CCJ-21-0062 entitled "Reintegration Experiences in a Sample of Israeli Parolees on Completion of Their Term of Supervision: A Qualitative Study" which you submitted to Criminology & Criminal Justice, has been reviewed.  The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter. In the light of these comments and the reviewers’ recommendations, the decision of the editorial board is to ask you to (i) resubmit your paper for review addressing the issues raised by the reviewers, and (ii) make major revisions to your paper (its organisation and content) in line with the comments provided by the reviewers.  
  
To revise your manuscript, log into [https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/ccj](https://nam04.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fmc.manuscriptcentral.com%2Fccj&data=04%7C01%7CLior.Gideon%40hofstra.edu%7C355b4dde4ec04d4fc43a08d92b183327%7Ce32fc43d7c6246d9b49fcd53ba8d9424%7C0%7C0%7C637588205943423611%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C2000&sdata=EXJzwGCS2hvdA6BnsPDYc8xNq8utJTXTDmIxoKFtYok%3D&reserved=0) and enter your Author Center, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions."  Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.  You may also click the below link to start the revision process (or continue the process if you have already started your revision) for your manuscript. If you use the below link you will not be required to login to ScholarOne Manuscripts.  \*\*\* PLEASE NOTE: This is a two-step process. After clicking on the link, you will be directed to a webpage to confirm. \*\*\*  
  
[https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/ccj?URL\_MASK=7e316a1a8ac04a8ebab733fa81bc0f41](https://nam04.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fmc.manuscriptcentral.com%2Fccj%3FURL_MASK%3D7e316a1a8ac04a8ebab733fa81bc0f41&data=04%7C01%7CLior.Gideon%40hofstra.edu%7C355b4dde4ec04d4fc43a08d92b183327%7Ce32fc43d7c6246d9b49fcd53ba8d9424%7C0%7C0%7C637588205943423611%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C2000&sdata=9K5o3lviEa%2FQj9UbX98Y8mrW1276VP%2BooePuT55HQoo%3D&reserved=0)  
  
You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer. Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Center. When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided. We ask you to use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be AS SPECIFIC AS POSSIBLE in your response to the reviewer(s).  
  
IMPORTANT:  Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript.  Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.  
  
Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to Criminology & Criminal Justice, your revised manuscript should be uploaded as soon as possible, and not later than three months after receipt of this letter. If this is not possible for you, please contact us as soon as possible to arrange an alternative deadline. Revised papers that are not submitted within the agreed timescale may be treated as new submissions. Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to Criminology & Criminal Justice. We look forward to receiving your revision.  
  
Best wishes,  
  
Loraine Gelsthorpe, Anita Lavorgna and Pamela Ugwudike (Co-Editors-in-Chief).  
  
Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:  
  
Reviewer: 1  
  
Comments to the Author  
This manuscript deals with how 17 men experienced a particular rehabilitation and reintegration service provided by the Israeli Prisoners Rehabilitation Authority (IPRA). The text is a revised version of a manuscript I have previously reviewed for a different journal. Although the revision has strengthened the manuscript, I do believe that more work is needed in order to prepare the study for an international audience. My comments are as follows:  
  
First of all, the revised manuscript does a much better job at interacting with contemporary desistance research. As a result, the review of literature connects with present issues in life-course criminology and desistance research specifically, which allows for the manuscript to build on this body of research in search of its own contribution to the field. The authors have also taken care to revise the language of the paper, which has been greatly improved.  
  
However, the main issue with the manuscript still pertains to the **wider contribution** that this piece of research can present to the field, and this needs to be addressed in the introduction, throughout the analysis, and in the concluding discussion. As it reads now, the aim and scope of the study is far to modest. It is set out to compliment a previous evaluation of a particular probation intervention program in Israel. This very narrow scope returns in the concluding discussion, where the authors suggest that future research should include "those who failed to complete the IPRA program". Maybe we should change the wording, and be more forward in arguing that “…the study aims to compliment previous evaluation of a particular intervention program while further identify potential factors that may have positive effect on the reintegration process and lead to crime free life.”   
  
In short, the authors need to revise their manuscript with focus on how to make their findings more relevant to an international audience. As stated in my previous review, the block quotes show that the interviewers had good rapport with the men, and that their interviewing technique allowed for in-depth conversations about how the men experienced their attempts at desistance. I maintain that the manuscript presents interesting data from a rich set of interviews, but the authors need to discuss these findings more in-depth in order to show readers what their contribution is. The concluding discussion is largely untouched from the last time I reviewed this piece of research. Thus, my previous comments still stand: What do the author(s) want an international audience to learn while reading this? What should be the main takeaway? As it now reads, the manuscript is far too descriptive. Naturally, I leave it to the authors to come up with answers to these questions. Nevertheless, in this review I give my own view of some findings I believe are particularly valuable and could be considered for the authors to expand upon.   
  
The interview quote stating that "Both individual and group sessions were very good and effective. They both changed me a lot, way more than prison did" offers some valuable points that could be developed further by the authors. It seems to me that this short quote is telling of the expectations of prison (it is supposed to change you for the better), of its reality (it does not deliver on this expected outcome) and of talking therapy as a promising alternative. All of these points are interesting and valuable to an international audience.  
  
Another point that could be expanded on is how reluctant the participants were to divulge their pasts to potential employers, but nevertheless had to do so in order to fulfil their obligations to probation services. Here, interviewees seem to view the formal control put on them in supervision as a hindrance to their personal reform? Contemporary desistance research has discussed how desisters manage the stigma that comes with a previous deviant lifestyle, and this finding could contribute to this ongoing research discussion.  
  
The discussion on future aspirations of desisters is good and relates to previous research in a meaningful way. The same goes for the discussion on the desistance processes of those convicted of white-collar crimes. I believe that the authors could expand this discussion a bit further. Based on the findings presented in the manuscript, it seems to me that part of the success for this particular group lies in the fact that they were allowed to utilize their networks in order to secure themselves meaningful employment as part of their supervision. I believe that this is quite unique internationally, i.e. that other prison- and probation services would be less likely to allow probationers such influence. If I am right about that, this offers an opportunity for this paper to present a good example which could offer hand-fast direction for social work outside of Israel.  
  
The fact that the sample is diverse is a good thing. However, the authors do not address important aspects of this diversity in their analysis. For example, since the educational level of the sample varied from nine to 17 formal years of schooling, and some even held academic degrees, it is reasonable to assume that labour market attachment will vary accordingly. This could be discussed further within the manuscript.  
  
Lastly, the manuscript separates findings from discussion in a way that is uncommon for qualitative research. Most of the time, this separation works as the discussion is closely tied to what has been shown in the findings section. On a few instances, the link between points made in the discussion and the data presented under findings is less clear. One such occasion is the remark that "It appears that the IPRA places great importance on matching therapists with individual clients to enable the cultivation of trust that will further treatment outcomes" (p. 19 rows 38-42). This sounds like an important point and one that I would like the authors to make (even expand on), but it needs to be backed up by data in a clearer way than is the case presently.  
  
In conclusion, seeing as the authors target a journal with an international audience, the manuscript has to offer a solid contribution to the field which is relevant and interesting to the journal's readers. I do believe that a thorough and careful revision has the capacity to explicate interesting and important findings fit for such an audience.  
  
Reviewer: 2  
  
Comments to the Author  
The paper is well written and brings an important contribution to the understanding of reentry from the GLM perspective.  
  
I would urge the author(s) to explain why participants who dropped out or were recalled were not involved in the study. It may be that those with positive experience were pre-selected among those who successfully terminated the post-release supervision.  
The book of Armstrong and Durnescu (edts, 2016) may also be useful on the discussion regarding the role of supervision in the post-release stage and how it can frustrate the process of personal transformation.