

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_102598
Title of the Manuscript:	THE BALANCING GAME: PROBING THE LIVED EXPERIENCES OF COLLEGE STUDYING MOTHERS
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<https://www.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>It is an interesting effort that tries to interpret using the Role Theory the experiences of student- young mothers, shedding light on the difficulties, pressures, obstacles, motivations and sources of support via their stories. The methodology seems appropriate to the theme and scope of the article.</p> <p>The TITLE is representative of the content and attractive to the reader. It could be clarified that it is about "young" mothers.</p> <p>The ABSTRACT provides clear information. Only the comments of the first themes seems short regarding the third.</p> <p>The length of the discussion was disproportionate to the other parties. Maybe the "Trustworthiness" could be restricted to allow the authors a greater interpretation of the results.</p> <p>The structure of the article needs to be better organised so that information (about the scope and the methodological choices) is not repeated. Also is suggested that the "Scope and Limitations of the Study" fits better in Methodology. Likewise the "Conceptual Framework" should not precede the analysis as it is part of it.</p> <p>The evidence is based on recent data.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Adequate enough, but a linguistic editing is recommended.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The references should be written according to the Journal Guidelines. The word limit has been exceeded. >6000.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Karela Christina
Department, University & Country	School of Humanities, Hellenic Open University, Greece