OPEN PEER REVIEW

Gender and Online Political Participation (Case Study: Students of Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz Branch)

Ramin. Shafiani[1] · Hamed. Ameri Golestani[2*] · Hamed. Mohagheghnia[2] · Fereydoun. Akbarzadeh[2]

[1] Ph.D. Student of Political Science, Department of Political Science, Ahvaz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz, Iran
[2] Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Ahvaz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: hamed.ameri@gmail.com

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The statement "political participation is one of the most important manifestations of political activity" is too broad. Consider elaborating on the specific dimensions of political participation relevant to the study's context.

The claim about the role of hashtags in shaping public opinion could benefit from specific examples or references to key events in Iran for better contextualization.

Perry's dimensions of political participation are mentioned but not directly linked to online contexts. Consider elaborating on how these dimensions translate into virtual activities.

Clarify how the sample size of 380 was determined. Was it based on a specific statistical formula or precedent in similar studies?

The analysis of social network use does not account for potential confounding variables like age or socioeconomic status. Discussing these limitations would enhance the findings' credibility.

The statement "only active participation differs between men and women" seems to overlook nuances in passive participation. Revisiting this analysis might reveal subtler patterns.

The section mentions "societal values" influencing political apathy among women. This claim could be supported with references to sociological studies or cultural analyses.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2.   Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

While the study notes a lack of prior research in Khuzestan Province, it could provide more detailed justification for choosing this specific location.

The mention of studies in Kurdistan and Isfahan focuses on general trends but does not explain how these findings might relate to the study's hypothesis. Adding a comparative analysis would strengthen the section.

The resource theory and its connection to social network participation need more explanation. How does this theory specifically apply to the gender differences observed in the study?

The questionnaire is briefly described, but a detailed breakdown of its structure (e.g., number of items, scales used) would improve transparency.

The gender differences in active participation are significant, but the discussion lacks depth. For instance, why might women score lower in managing political websites or signing petitions?

The finding that Twitter use significantly affects active participation is compelling but requires more discussion. What unique features of Twitter contribute to this impact?

The claim that "social networks do not necessarily increase political participation" contradicts some of the findings. This requires clarification or adjustment to align with the data.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2.   Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.
Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.