

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on A Sustainable Extractive Industry Requires Educated Responsible Geoscientists

Perspective, Earth Sci. Syst. Soc.

Reviewer: Roberto Lencina

Submitted on: 04 Sep 2021

Article DOI: 10.3389/esss.2022.10046

### EVALUATION

#### **Q 1** Please summarize the findings and viewpoint reported.

The author remarks a relevant challenge we have to improve the management of our natural resources; however, it's especially important the experience in Canada, for example, other similar in South America (Brazil-Chile-Argentina)

#### **Q 2** Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Limitations:

1. The article needs more details to discuss not only references to a specific workshop or similar

Strengths

1. The issue is relevant and very important, and I consider that we need more contributions like this paper

#### **Q 3** Please comment on the reported results and data interpretation. If there are any objective errors or fundamental flaws, you should please detail your concerns.

Please review the discussion and references

#### **Q 4** Check List

Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes.

Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Not Applicable.

Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

Yes.

If the manuscript includes original data, are the applied methods accurate and comprehensively described?

Not Applicable.

Are the statistical methods valid and correctly applied? (e.g. sample size, choice of test)

Not Applicable.

Are the data underlying the study available in either the article, supplement, or deposited in a repository?

Not Applicable.

Does the study adhere to ethical standards including ethics committee approval and consent procedure?

Yes.

**Q 5** Please provide your detailed review report to the editor and authors (including any comments on the Q4 Check List):

Dear Dr

I think is particularly important the issue you are sharing with this article; however, I consider that you can add more relevant papers (in line with your ideas) to improve the impact of the publication.

**QUALITY ASSESSMENT**

<b>Q 6</b> Originality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q 7</b> Rigor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q 8</b> Significance to the field	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q 9</b> Interest to a general audience	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q 10</b> Quality of the writing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q 11</b> Overall quality of the study	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**REVISION LEVEL**

**Q 12** What is the level of revision required based on your comments:

Minor revisions.