

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_128832
Title of the Manuscript:	Unveiling Gender Dynamics in Career Decision-Making: Insights from students of University of Technology and Applied Sciences, (UTAS) Sultanate of Oman
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: Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript holds significant importance as it explores gender dynamics in career decisions. The topic is highly pertinent to the current global context. The factors examined in the study are particularly relevant for students and offer valuable insights for policymakers as well.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is suitable.	
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.	The abstract should include key elements such as the aim, methodology, findings, and other relevant aspects, rewritten to align with the journal's guidelines.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, it is correct.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The introduction is too brief and should be expanded to adequately reflect the current scenario, the motivation behind the study, and its objectives.</li> <li>2. The article requires restructuring; the methodology section should follow the literature review, and the author must adhere to the journal's guidelines in this regard.</li> <li>3. There are spelling and grammar errors in the manuscript that need to be corrected.</li> <li>4. While interpreting Table 2, the author has mistakenly referred to it as Table 1.</li> <li>5. Some references are missing, such as Krejcie and Morgan (1970). The authors should ensure proper referencing in accordance with the journal's guidelines.</li> </ol>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Arjuna Kumar Maharana
Department, University & Country	Gangadhar Meher University, India