



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
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

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>The references should be ordered alphabetically.</p> <p>I recommend the author to provide the results from meta analysis of the studies indicating some factors related to single parents' career.</p> <p>At least, state more clearly the goal of this article and formulate in the conclusion definite models of single parents' career counselling and single parents' life trajectories in France.</p>	<p>The reference were ordered alphabetically</p> <p>The goal was clarified in the abstract.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Please, revise in the abstract "...there are a considerable volumes...", "...to what extent does this articulation activates..."</p> <p>Regarding the sentence "Chardon & Daguet (2009) pointed out that 16% of minor children live in single parent families (vs. 63% with a couple)", could you indicate concerning the other percentages till 100%, who do they live with? – in institutions, with other relatives, etc.</p>	<p>The abstract was revised</p> <p>The missing data were added</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		