



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART A:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BJAST/1682
Title of the Manuscript:	Spatial Relationship between Illiteracy and Unemployment at Governorate Level in Egypt-2006.

(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper)



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART B: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected'/ if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
General comment:	Although the subject is very interesting, the style to take this subject into account is not well established. The English is very poor, Punctuation is very poor and also grammar is awful.	
Specific comments:	No comment.	
Title and abstract	Title is not good enough. The year 2006 must have another place to be stated. It is same in abstract. First it was written with so poor English. The importance of the study is absent.	
Introduction (Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)	In the section English is so poor again. No attention for punctuation and writing. The novelty is lost. The importance of the study is lost. The literature is so crowded. Who will benefit from this study??? The answer is absent.	
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	References are adequate.	
Materials & methods (Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work)	The material and method are suitable for the purpose in consideration.	
Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)	It is needed a table to report the results. Diagnostics and discussion are fair enough.	
Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?	No deficiency	
Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only)	Conclusion was not set appropriate for a scientific article. No importance, no aim, no consistency or inconsistency with previous studies, no restrictions and no policy implications.	
References	References are adequate.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Can Tansel Tugcu
Department, University & Country	Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Nevsehir University, Turkey.