

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_111282
Title of the Manuscript:	Causes and Consequences of Geographic Illiteracy in the United States
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

Review Form 1.7

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<p>The manuscript addresses a critical and timely issue—geographic illiteracy in the United States. With a comprehensive exploration of factors contributing to this phenomenon, including cultural biases, curricular challenges, governmental policies, economic influences, and perceptions of geography, the manuscript sheds light on the multidimensional nature of the problem.</p> <p>The title "Geographic Illiteracy in the United States: A Multifaceted Analysis" is suitable as it accurately reflects the manuscript's central theme and its comprehensive exploration of the various dimensions of geographic illiteracy.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. It provides a clear and concise overview of the main topics covered in the manuscript. The abstract outlines the central thesis of geographic illiteracy in the United States and previews the multifaceted analysis presented in the paper.</p> <p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be appropriate. The manuscript is well-organized and follows a logical flow of ideas. Each subsection is clearly defined and contributes to the overall understanding of the central thesis on geographic illiteracy in the United States.</p> <p>The manuscript explores the issue of geographic illiteracy in the United States, analyzing its causes and consequences. It delves into cultural, curricular, governmental, economic, and perception-related factors influencing geographic literacy.</p> <p>The manuscript contains a comprehensive list of references, drawing on various sources to support the arguments presented. The inclusion of diverse references from multiple perspectives enhances the credibility of the work.</p>	<p>This assessment is very good and communicates the author's intent. Thank you.</p> <p>I really like this title here, and I am motivated to adopt this as part of a more descriptive title.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed with reviewer, as paper was outlined before research and writing to enable sequential flow.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>The reflected literature in the manuscript touches on all the main sources that speak to the subject matter. The literature is viable up to 2007, but thereafter, the subject is dealt with as related themes. Diverse perspectives are afforded throughout literature.</p>
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>The language and English quality in the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The text is well-written, with clear and coherent sentences. However, there are a few instances where sentence structure and grammar could be improved for smoother readability. A thorough proofreading and editing process would enhance the overall language quality and ensure a polished presentation.</p>	<p>The paper was re-read for quality of communication, clarity, and sentence construction. The author is a native speaker of English. Review will be conducted on writing again before submission.</p>
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.7

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>	No ethical issues or conflict of interest.