

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	

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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	yes It would be appropriate to mention the type of study. "Causes and Consequences of Geographic Illiteracy in the United States – A Critical Review" Yes Refer to the General comments section Yes Yes	The author agrees with reviewer. Author likes this suggestion and may adopt this addition. Abstract is indeed clear.
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	1. The sentence "the researcher sets out by placing.." in the abstract could be rephrased as it is sounding like a 3 rd person's statement. 2. I would suggest a structured abstract. Aim, Method, Results, Conclusion 3. It is better to include materials and method sub section and describe about the number of articles/books referred and how they were searched for 4. To include a hypothesis 5. To include the limitations and future prospects of this research under a sub heading	1. We generally write in the 3 rd person rather than 1 st person for peer-reviewed/scholarly. Therefore, "The researcher, the writer, the author", and the like are used. 2. Not sure if a structured abstract is necessary but will try it. 3. Could be mentioned if structured abstract is adopted. 4. Nothing being hypothesized in this research, so hypothesis is not necessary. 5. Limitations and future prospects are not necessary as this is more of a conceptual or review paper with some recommendations.

[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 issue or conflict of interest in this paper.