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Nov 22, 2022

Dear Hannah Buie,

I have now received 1 review of your manuscript “The Social Media Sexist Content (SMSC) Database: A Database of Content and Comments for Research Use”, from researchers with special expertise in social psychology (sorry for the delay I had strong difficulties to find reviewers). I also independently read the manuscript before consulting this review. The reviewer had some positive reactions to your manuscript (but also found some very important things to change). I agree that your manuscript has important strengths and also that there are some issues that need to be addressed. I therefore encourage you to submit a revised version for further consideration at Collabra: Psychology.

The reviewer did an outstanding job in the review. I will highlight issues I think are particularly salient here. In your resubmission, please include a document with a point-by-point response to both the points I list here and the reviewers’ comments, outlining each change made in your manuscript or providing a suitable rebuttal.

Major revisions:

* Develop the literature review in the first part of the article.
* Clearly specify your methodological choices with references.
* Make the methodological part clearer.

Minor revisions:

* Strengthen the discussion section, especially with examples
* add a short conclusion / take home message by the end

Please ensure that your revised files adhere to our author guidelines, and that the files are fully copyedited/proofed prior to upload. Please also ensure that all copyright permissions have been obtained. This may be the last opportunity for major editing, therefore please fully check your file prior to re-submission.

If you have any questions or difficulties during this process, please contact the editorial office at [editorialoffice@collabra.org](mailto:editorialoffice@collabra.org).

We hope you can submit your revision within the next six weeks. If you cannot make this deadline, please let us know as early as possible.

Sincerely,

Amélie Bret

# Reviewer 1

##### Rating scale questions

|  | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong construct validity (good measures and/or manipulations of the constructs the authors wish to study). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript) |  | ✔ |  |  |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong statistical validity (appropriate statistical tests, assumptions are clear and reasonable, no statistical errors, appropriate statistical inferences, etc.). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript) |  | ✔ |  |  |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong internal validity (any causal claims or implications are well-justified, alternative explanations are thoroughly considered, etc.). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript, or no causal claims are made or even vaguely implied.) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong external validity (authors appropriately constrain their conclusions based on the limits of the generalizability of their findings to other contexts (including from lab to real world), other populations, other stimuli or measures, etc.) |  |  |  | ✔ |  |

##### Open response questions

### Please write your review here. The author(s) will see this review. Your identity will not be revealed to the authors unless you also include your name (i.e., sign your review) in this box. It is up to you whether to reveal your identity or not, either is fine.

This article presents the Social Media Sexist Content (SMSC) database. A Database of sexist and neutral Content and Comments.  
I think it’s a very good idea to propose this material and it can help many researchers in realizing studies on this issue.  
Although the topic of this article is interesting, I believe that the article cannot be published in this state in a psychology journal, but need a major revision .

In general, authors make little reference to previous work in (social) psychology on these issues, in the introduction and discussions, and this is, in my opinion, one of the main limitations of this article. Additionally, in several points (the introduction, the methodology…) I do not find a classic structure of an article in psychology. I invite the authors to better structure their article.

Generally can you give concrete details of what you call “social media content/ post” and “content-related comments” ? if you put a definition or example at the beginning of the article, that will make it easier to understand.

Here some suggestions to improve your article :

I think that, at the beginning of your article, you should explain more that sexism is very present in social media platforms. I recommend starting the article by explaining the pervasive phenomenon of online sexism and its consequences for users (By doing a rapid review of the literature). This, in my opinion, would make your work even more relevant.

I would also like to have a rapid literature review of the methods previously used to study these issues. For example, you write : “Unfortunately, there is a dearth of non- proprietary research examining interactions within actual platforms where people feel like they are interacting with other people”. I agree with you, but I would like to see here a paragraph in which methods through which similar phenomena (sexist interaction between people) have been studied and their limitations. you can for example cite the paradigm used by Galdi et al., 2014 and explain why you think using another method is better.

“For a mock social media website to be realistic it must include a substantial amount of neutral filler content” I partially agree with this statement. let me explain it is true for research that has to do with social media, but not only. In general, if we are interested in sensitive issues like sexism, violence, we try to use neutral stimuli. I encourage you to review this sentence.

In the introduction we can found a big paragraph on " In this paper, we define gender as a social construct”. It is interesting, but I don’t think the end of the introduction is the right place to put it. personally, I would put it as a foot note (and reduced).

The paragraphs on sexism and objectification of women are interesting and relevant but could be shortened and better integrated with the rest of the article.

In the method you explain that you use measure of emotional reactions (feeling Ashamed, Insecure, and/or Angry). However, in the theoretical introduction you do not refer to emotional reactions. I can understand why you are interested in these measures, but you should mention it in the introduction and justify it on previous studies.

If I understand correctly, you use content from research assistants’ social media. Did you go through an ethics committee to do your study, if yes I suggest you mention it.

“In the content development stage, a group of 4 research assistants compiled social media content and comments using the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick & Fiske, 1997) as a guide for selecting content that fit the categories of Hostile Sexism, Benevolent Sexism, or neither (neutral content and comments)” I suggest you give some examples of content categorized as hostile, benevolent, or neutral. The same thing applies to other items /comments.  
At page 9 you write “We conducted two separate content rating studies” to make it easier to read I suggest you present them clearly as two different studies : study 1 (and explain the method and results) study 2 (and explain the method and results).  
Generally, I invite you to better structure the methodology and results to make them clearer.  
I’ll premise that I’m not a specialist in the methodology used, but I was wondering if you had relied on an observation grid to evaluate the content of content and comments. If yes can you give more information’s ? Or some examples  
in discussions I invite you to discuss your results based on theory. for example, there are other studies showing that women react more strongly than men to the Hostile Sexism?  
In the discussion you write “Further, we made preliminary attempts to allow for intersectional research by including content targeting White, BIPOC, and Latina/x women,”. This was not clear to me, it should be better specified in the methodology  
At the end of the article I would like to see a concluding sentence with a take home message of your study.

**Author Response**  
Dec 14, 2022

December XX, 2022

Dr. Amélie Bret

Editor

Collabra: Psychology

Dear Dr. Bret,

Thank you for the opportunity to revise and resubmit our manuscript entitled “The Social Media Sexist Content (SMSC) Database: A Database of Content and Comments for Research Use.” My co-author and I are delighted that the paper will be further considered for publication in *Collabra: Psychology*.

We have substantially revised the manuscript to address the excellent comments offered by you and the anonymous reviewer. We believe that your collective feedback allowed us to significantly improve the paper, and we are grateful for your insights. A detailed list of our responses to your comments follows below the signature in this letter.

Among many other improvements, you will see that in keeping with suggestions, we

have:

1. Developed the literature review in the introduction.
2. Clearly specified our methodological choices with references.
3. Restructured the paper to clarify our methodological approach.

Thank you again for your consideration. We are grateful for the enthusiasm that you and the reviewers expressed for the current research (in addition to the valuable constructive feedback), as we believe that the database will provide an important tool for researchers. Please do not hesitate to contact me if there is anything that I can clarify, or if you feel that there are additional points that should be addressed. We sincerely hope you will feel that this significantly revised version of the manuscript is worthy of publication in *Collabra: Psychology*, and look forward to receiving your feedback.

Sincerely,

The authors (blinded for review)

**Editor’s comments:**

**Major revisions:  
- Develop the literature review in the first part of the article.**

We appreciate this feedback and have added extensive sections to the literature review on pages 3-5 and 10, explained in greater detail below in response to Reviewer 1’s feedback.

**- Clearly specify your methodological choices with references.**

Thank you for this suggestion. We have done our best to explain and specify our methodological decisions in the revised manuscript and added references where possible. In many cases, however, the stimuli and measures used in the studies were generated by our research team (rather than borrowed or adapted from existing work). As such, it was not possible to include references for these items and so we added language in the Method section to clarify that those particular items (e.g., stimuli or measures) were developed by the research team for the purposes of the current studies. Our hope is that by more explicitly stating this information, along with restructuring the presentation of the methodology of each study (see response to next point), the justifications for our methodological choices will be much clearer.

**- Make the methodological part clearer.**

We conducted extensive revisions to the manuscript to clarify our methodology, including restructuring the paper to include a Study 1 and 2. We explain the changes in greater detail below in response to Reviewer 1’s feedback.

**Minor revisions:  
- Strengthen the discussion section, especially with examples**

We appreciate this feedback and elaborated more fully in the following pieces of the general discussion:

“The results of Studies 1 and 2 directly align with the theoretical frameworks of Ambivalent Sexism and Objectification. Consistent with research in Ambivalent Sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1997; 2001), the strongest results were the ratings in the Hostile Sexism domain. Results revealed the ratings of the Hostile Sexism in both Studies 1 and 2 were on the high end of the Hostile Sexism scale and were consistently higher across the emotional reaction scales compared to Neutral or Benevolent Sexist content and comments…. Importantly, this difference reflects the existing research in Ambivalent Sexism. Hostile sexism is easier for people to recognize and more clearly violates existing norms (Hall, 2021), whereas people tend to find benevolent sexism more ambiguous and harder to recognize (Dardenne, Dumont & Bollier, 2007). Additionally, more people personally endorse benevolent sexism relative to hostile sexism (Glick & Fiske, 2001), which might lead to greater variance in the rating of the content compared to a more clear-cut construct like hostile sexism. However, women did react more strongly to the Benevolent Sexism comments, with women rating these comments higher in Hostile Sexism and Objectification than men did. We suspect this might reflect a difference in how content posts versus comments are interpreted with posts being more passive and comments being more active, thereby generating a stronger response. Future research is needed to explore this possibility.”

**- add a short conclusion / take home message by the end**

We appreciate this feedback and have added the following concluding remarks on p. 29:

“In conclusion, this stimulus set is intended to help facilitate future research by easing the burden of collecting and pilot testing sexist, objectifying, and neutral stimuli. The SMSC database also provides experimental control in the selection of stimuli for use online or in other types of research paradigms, making the comparison of results across studies more realistic. Further, it could also assist replication studies by providing a common source for stimuli.”

**Reviewer 1’s comments:**

**I think it’s a very good idea to propose this material and it can help many researchers in realizing studies on this issue.**

We are grateful for this acknowledgment and agree that the database will be widely applicable, thank you!

**I think that, at the beginning of your article, you should explain more that sexism is very present in social media platforms. I recommend starting the article by explaining the pervasive phenomenon of online sexism and its consequences for users (By doing a rapid review of the literature). This, in my opinion, would make your work even more relevant.**

We appreciate this valuable feedback and have included a substantial addition to the beginning of the article explaining the prevalence of sexism on social media platforms from pp. 3 & 4:

“Social media platforms were initially seen as the ultimate tool of connection, enabling people to expand their social networks across cultures and international boundaries. Today, people report spending twice as much time socializing online versus in person (American Time Use Survey, 2019), and social media can be an important source of strengthening and supporting social relationships (Burke & Kraut, 2014). Unfortunately, instead of providing a utopian tool of inclusion and connection, social media platforms often exacerbate existing societal biases like sexism and objectification (Fosch-Villaronga, et al., 2021). Jokes targeting women’s competency are common (Drakett, et al., 2018; Fox, et al., 2015), and women are sexualized at an alarming rate (Bell, et al., 2018; Davis, 2018). For example, women are verbally abused on Twitter every 30 seconds. BIPOC women are about 3 times as likely to be mentioned by problematic or abusive Tweets than White women. Black women in particular are 8 times as likely to be targeted by problematic or abusive Tweets (Amnesty International, 2017). Further, social media platforms themselves know that sexist and objectifying content is having a negative impact on women and girls but are taking little to no action to mitigate this effect. For example, research conducted by Facebook found that 32% of teen girls said that Instagram exacerbates negative body image. Research also found that Instagram makes body image worse for 1 out of every 3 adolescent girls and can lead to increased anxiety and depression (Wells et al., 2021).

Since 2013, about 51.1 percent of the US population has been comprised of women. Informal and unspoken guidelines (i.e., social norms) inform how people are treated, including the differential treatment of men and women. Some of these social norms can serve as oppressive tools to maintain an unequal status quo (Jackman, 1994). In most modern societies, men have a higher status, controlling most economic streams (Alesina et al., 2013). This higher status informs how individuals in these societies think about men and women, often seeing men, the high-status group, as having greater societal value and import (Berger et al., 2018; Ridgeway, 1992; Schmader et al., 2001). Social norms like these are broadly established and legitimized through government policies, workplace cultures, and education, limiting the professional opportunities individuals seek, how people think about themselves, and interpersonal relationships (Block et al., 2019; Boesveld, 2020; Croft, Schmader, & Block, 2015; 2019; Kong, Kong, & Lu, 2020; Meara, Pastore, & Webster, 2020). These norms legitimize gender inequality, leading to disparities like lack of opportunity for women and lessened value of positions when they become more associated with women than men.

Social media platforms not only reflect these unequal societal gender norms but can also inflate them. For example, biased interactions like racism and sexism now occur more frequently online than face-to face (Tynes, et al., 2015), likely due to the relative social distance and anonymity online interactions can have (Fox, et al., 2015). Further, sexism and objectification are typically ignored or ingratiated rather than confronted online (Mallett, et al., 2019). The amplification of sexism and objectification combined with the lack of confrontation potentially creates permissive norms on social media platforms, perpetuating these types of biases.

While some people attempt to filter out this bias by blocking perpetrators, widespread sexism and objectification on these platforms can make it impossible to avoid because the current algorithms and underlying structure of social media platforms uniquely fosters vulnerability to the expression of prejudice, especially for adolescent populations.”

**I would also like to have a rapid literature review of the methods previously used to study these issues. For example, you write : “Unfortunately, there is a dearth of non- proprietary research examining interactions within actual platforms where people feel like they are interacting with other people”. I agree with you, but I would like to see here a paragraph in which methods through which similar phenomena (sexist interaction between people) have been studied and their limitations. you can for example cite the paradigm used by Galdi et al., 2014 and explain why you think using another method is better.**

We appreciate this feedback and agree that some clarity could be added to this section. Indeed, in this section of the paper, our intent is to point to a gap in the literature rather than critique other methodological approaches. Many studies using other methodologies have contributed important findings to the literature in this area. Instead, we are seeking to illuminate an area for novel research and provide a tool that will help researchers fill this gap. To clarify this intent, we added the following text to pp. 4 & 5:

“Much of the existing literature is correlational (e.g., Meier & Gray, 2013; Stanton et al., 2017) or analyzes existing social media content (e.g., Döring & Mohseni, 2019; Drakett et al., 2018; Paciello, et al., 2021). These approaches have strengths and weaknesses, but most importantly illustrate a gap in the literature regarding the type of questions researchers are able to address. For example, correlational research often requires participants to reflect on their past experiences with using social media, leading to low experimental control and an inability to draw conclusions about causality. Analyzing existing social media content is valuable in its ecological validity, however it lacks experimental control in comparisons. Greater experimental control along with high ecological validity is now possible due to…”

**“For a mock social media website to be realistic it must include a substantial amount of neutral filler content” I partially agree with this statement. let me explain it is true for research that has to do with social media, but not only. In general, if we are interested in sensitive issues like sexism, violence, we try to use neutral stimuli. I encourage you to review this sentence.**

We appreciate this feedback and agree that the sentence could be revised to include more generality in this area. Accordingly, we revised the sentence on p. 5:

“Similar to other research topics and paradigms investigating topics like sexism or violence, for a mock social media website to be realistic it must include a substantial amount of neutral filler content on the newsfeed as well as posts the target the construct that is being examined.”

**In the introduction we can found a big paragraph on " In this paper, we define gender as a social construct”. It is interesting, but I don’t think the end of the introduction is the right place to put it. personally, I would put it as a foot note (and reduced).**

We appreciate this suggestion, and while we are grateful for the Reviewer's perspective, we feel that this section explains a critical piece of our rationale in the current research. Thus, we are concerned that moving it to a footnote would undermine the importance this line of thinking played in guiding our decision making. If, however, the editor feels that the paper would significantly stronger if we made this change, we would certainly do so in a revision.

**The paragraphs on sexism and objectification of women are interesting and relevant but could be shortened and better integrated with the rest of the article.**

As with the previous comment, and in keeping with the other reviewer and editor comments regarding enhancing the theoretical richness of the introduction, we would like to respectfully argue in favor of preserving this section of the introduction because it outlines the major theoretical basis for the selection of our stimuli. That said, however, we are of course willing to reconsider this decision upon further revision as requested.

**In the method you explain that you use measure of emotional reactions (feeling Ashamed, Insecure, and/or Angry). However, in the theoretical introduction you do not refer to emotional reactions. I can understand why you are interested in these measures, but you should mention it in the introduction and justify it on previous studies.**

We agree that this is an important component to include in the introduction. Accordingly, we added the following text on p. 10:

“Emotional reactions to sexism and objectification on social media platforms are also important to understand as emotional reactions have been shown to mediate prejudice confrontation (e.g., Thomas et al., 2020), bystander intervention (e.g., Barhight et al., 2013; Yule & Grych, 2017), and wellbeing outcomes (Kaiser, et al., 2004; McCoy & Major, 2003). These are all important areas of research, with long-term implications, in the context of social media platforms. Accordingly, the content in the database contains participant ratings along dimensions of ambivalent sexism and objectification, as well as feelings of shame, insecurity, and anger in response to encountering the sexist content and comments.”

**If I understand correctly, you use content from research assistants’ social media. Did you go through an ethics committee to do your study, if yes I suggest you mention it.**

We appreciate this feedback and now include the following statement on p.11:

“This research was reviewed and approved by the ethics review board at our institution.”

**“In the content development stage, a group of 4 research assistants compiled social media content and comments using the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick & Fiske, 1997) as a guide for selecting content that fit the categories of Hostile Sexism, Benevolent Sexism, or neither (neutral content and comments)” I suggest you give some examples of content categorized as hostile, benevolent, or neutral. The same thing applies to other items /comments.**

We understand how referencing the examples we provide in the paper at this stage might be helpful to the reader. To do so, we add the following text on p. 12:

“A group of 4 research assistants compiled social media content and comments using the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick & Fiske, 1997) as a guide for selecting content that fit the categories of Hostile Sexism, Benevolent Sexism, or neither (neutral content). Examples of content items are included in Figures 2 and 4.”

**At page 9 you write “We conducted two separate content rating studies” to make it easier to read I suggest you present them clearly as two different studies : study 1 (and explain the method and results) study 2 (and explain the method and results).  
Generally, I invite you to better structure the methodology and results to make them clearer.**

We appreciate this feedback and have restructured the paper to include a Study 1 and 2. These revisions are extensive and occur on pp. 11-27.

**I’ll premise that I’m not a specialist in the methodology used, but I was wondering if you had relied on an observation grid to evaluate the content of content and comments. If yes can you give more information’s ? Or some examples**

We apologize for the confusion, which we suspect might have been caused by the grid-like appearance of stimuli in Figures 2 and 4 and Table 1. Those arrangements were made simply for ease of presentation in the manuscript, but participants only saw one content item or comment at a time during the actual studies. We added clarifying text on p. 13 to make this more explicit and hopefully prevent confusion among future readers:

“After reading the instructions, participants were presented with the 100 items one-by-one in an individually randomized order and were asked to rate them along dimensions of sexism and objectification. Content items were rated one at a time. After rating each post, participants clicked a button to move on to the next screen, which showed the next content item.”

**in discussions I invite you to discuss your results based on theory. for example, there are other studies showing that women react more strongly than men to the Hostile Sexism?**

We appreciate this feedback and have extended how we discuss our finding in terms of existing theory in the following paragraph on p. 28.

“The results of Studies 1 and 2 directly align with the theoretical frameworks of Ambivalent Sexism and Objectification. Consistent with research in Ambivalent Sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1997; 2001), the strongest results were the ratings in the Hostile Sexism domain. Results revealed the ratings of the Hostile Sexism in both Studies 1 and 2 were on the high end of the Hostile Sexism scale and were consistently higher across the emotional reaction scales compared to Neutral or Benevolent Sexist content and comments….Importantly, this difference reflects the existing research in Ambivalent Sexism. Hostile sexism is easier for people to recognize and more clearly violates existing norms (Hall, 2021), whereas people tend to find benevolent sexism more ambiguous and harder to recognize (Dardenne, Dumont & Bollier, 2007). Additionally, more people personally endorse benevolent sexism relative to hostile sexism (Glick & Fiske, 2001), which might lead to greater variance in the rating of the content compared to a more clear-cut construct like hostile sexism. However, women did react more strongly to the Benevolent Sexism comments, with women rating these comments higher in Hostile Sexism and Objectification than men did. We suspect this might reflect a difference in how content posts versus comments are interpreted with posts being more passive and comments being more active, thereby generating a stronger response. Future research is needed to explore this possibility.”

**In the discussion you write “Further, we made preliminary attempts to allow for intersectional research by including content targeting White, BIPOC, and Latina/x women,”. This was not clear to me, it should be better specified in the methodology**

We agree that this is a point best clarified in the method section. We now include the following sentence on p. 11:

“We include content in the database from different social groups including Black and Latina/x women. Intentionally representing different groups of women in the stimulus set was important in order to allow for research examining intersectional identities. While we do not examine or report group differences based on intersectional identities here, future researchers will be able to using the stimulus ratings provided in the database.”

**At the end of the article I would like to see a concluding sentence with a take home message of your study.**

We appreciate this feedback and have added the following concluding remarks on p. 31:

“In conclusion, this stimulus set is intended to help facilitate future research by easing the burden of collecting and pilot testing sexist, objectifying, and neutral stimuli for use online or in other types of research paradigms. The SMSC database also provides experimental control in the selection of stimuli, making the comparison of results across studies more realistic. Further, it could also assist replication studies by providing a common source for stimuli.”

**Editor Final Decision:** Accept

Feb 10, 2023

Dear Hannah Buie,

I have now had a chance to read over your manuscript “The Social Media Sexist Content (SMSC) Database: A Database of Content and Comments for Research Use”, along with the letter describing the changes you made. Thank you for your responsiveness to the concerns that the reviewers and I raised. I am happy to say that your paper is now officially accepted for publication in Collabra: Psychology. Congratulations on this work, I think it will make an important contribution to the literature and I look forward to seeing it published! I hope your experiences with Collabra: Psychology have been positive and that you will continue to consider it as an outlet for your work.

Please consider one last thing suggested by reviewer 1 : “I have just a small modification to ask: Page 3 “Since 2013, about 51.1 percent of the US population has been comprised of women. I don’t think this sentence is essential I suggest you remove it.”

After that you will be receiving separate correspondence regarding any production and technical comments, data deposits, as well as publication charges. We work with the Copyright Clearance Center to process any applicable APC charges. Please note that your APC transaction must be completed before your article gets published.

You will have an opportunity to check the page proofs before we publish your article. Thank you again for publishing in Collabra: Psychology.

Sincerely,  
Amélie Bret

# Reviewer 1

##### Rating scale questions

|  | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong construct validity (good measures and/or manipulations of the constructs the authors wish to study). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript) |  |  |  | ✔ |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong statistical validity (appropriate statistical tests, assumptions are clear and reasonable, no statistical errors, appropriate statistical inferences, etc.). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript) |  |  |  | ✔ |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong internal validity (any causal claims or implications are well-justified, alternative explanations are thoroughly considered, etc.). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript, or no causal claims are made or even vaguely implied.) |  |  |  | ✔ |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong external validity (authors appropriately constrain their conclusions based on the limits of the generalizability of their findings to other contexts (including from lab to real world), other populations, other stimuli or measures, etc.) |  |  |  | ✔ |  |

##### Open response questions

### Please write your review here. The author(s) will see this review. Your identity will not be revealed to the authors unless you also include your name (i.e., sign your review) in this box. It is up to you whether to reveal your identity or not, either is fine.

First, I wanted to thank you for your work and for brilliantly responding to my comments. I believe that the manuscript has been significantly improved and that it is much clearer and more fluid to read.  
I still think the paragraph on gender and sex is a bit long, but if you don’t want to edit it, It is fine for me.  
Now the paragraphs on sexism and objectification are well integrated with the rest of the introductions, so I agree with your decision not to change them  
I have just a small modification to ask: Page 3 “Since 2013, about 51.1 percent of the US population has been comprised of women. I don’t think this sentence is essential I suggest you remove it.