



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	2015_AIR_16166
Title of the Manuscript:	Career counseling and life trajectories in France: research and perspectives for single parenthood
Type of the Article	Mini review Article

**General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>The author says that the paper wants <i>to show</i> (l. 6) how that issues affecting women 'life trajectory. Instead, the author should say to want <i>to discuss</i> this issue and not "<i>to show how</i>" because he did not conduct empirical research. This can be confusing when you read the abstract.</p> <p>Similarly, the author can not write "hypothesis" (l. 7) because it is not empirical research.</p> <p>The literature review is satisfactory, the author uses recent and relevant research. It would be good that the author determine the period prescribed the used research. From year until that year? And how did he select the research and which database are used.</p> <p>I think the conclusion is a weak point of the manuscript. The findings do not seem to conclusions but rather more discussion. The author speaks of "new paradigm on the CS in social Science", but neither explains nor deepens the issue.</p>	<p>We corrected the paper according to the advice</p> <p>We corrected the paper according to the advice we used the most recent data available</p>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	What the author hopes to reach (L. 114) is very broad and comprehensive. The paper does not seem to achieve this goal. The author should be more specific in that aims with their study.	We gave more clear information regarding the goal of the paper.
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		