

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JGEESI_121047</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Is a geology degree worth it? An economic analysis: a review</b>
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript provides a thorough economic analysis of pursuing a geology degree, an area that is highly relevant for prospective students, educational institutions, and industry stakeholders. It effectively outlines the financial and non-financial benefits associated with a geology degree, while also addressing challenges faced by professionals in the field. This analysis contributes significantly to the discourse on the value of geosciences education and its impact on societal and environmental issues. The comprehensive nature of the review, coupled with its focus on both economic and non-monetary aspects, makes it a valuable resource for understanding the broader implications of geoscience careers.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The title "Is a Geology Degree Worth It? An Economic Analysis: A Review" is suitable as it accurately reflects the content of the manuscript. However, for greater specificity and clarity, the title could be revised to: "Evaluating the Value of a Geology Degree: An Economic and Societal Analysis."</p>	
<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<p>The abstract provides a clear overview of the manuscript's scope, including the economic viability and societal contributions of a geology degree. It summarizes the key findings and arguments effectively. However, it could be enhanced by briefly mentioning the specific challenges and considerations discussed in the paper, such as regulatory complexities and the need for skills diversification. This would offer a more rounded preview of the content.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, as it draws on a wide range of credible sources and recent data to support its analysis. It incorporates various dimensions of economic analysis, including salary data, job market trends, and the impact of regulatory frameworks. The integration of non-monetary benefits, such as societal contributions and personal fulfilment, is well-supported by relevant literature. The use of current references and adherence to established research standards reinforces the manuscript's validity.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> :</p>	<p>The references are generally sufficient and up-to-date, covering key aspects of the economic and societal analysis of a geology degree. However, including more recent studies or reports from 2023 or 2024 could provide additional context and relevance, especially in the rapidly evolving fields of geospatial technologies and environmental policy.</p>	
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>		

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

	<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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Zeeshan Adib Ahmed</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Babasaheb Naik College of Engineering, India</b>