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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The present study used the raw data from the '2019 time of life survey' of the National Statistical Office to investigate the time use and satisfaction of single-parent families according to gender. The results showed that the subjects spent the most time on Rest and sleep, followed by Instrumental activities of daily living (IADLs), Work, and Health management. While the male subjects spent more time on Work than the female subjects, and the female subjects spent more time on IADLs, Education and Social participation. The study is overall well conducted. Some minor points are listed as below. 1. A flowchart to demonstrate the study procedure will help the readers to better understand the study. 2. The statistical methods should be more detailed.
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**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This manuscript uses time-use data to study the time-use issues and their impact on satisfaction in single-parent families. I believe time-use is a meaningful topic. The author's research is valuable in terms of the design of the research methods and the results presented. However, there are some issues that need to be addressed before publication.

   Firstly, the study lacks research hypotheses, and 2-3 research hypotheses should be proposed. Secondly, it would be better to present Table 3 using graphics such as bar charts or pie charts. Thirdly, the current study lacks depth, only using basic descriptive statistical analysis, and could benefit from the addition of regression analysis or structural equation models.
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I recommend acceptance for publication.