



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:	This study analyzes the spatial patterns of illiteracy and unemployment at governorate level in Egypt respectively, and also examines the spatial correlations between the two. The empirical analyses include mapping and several spatial econometric techniques, such as global and local Moran's <i>I</i> and Wartenberg's measure, and have produced some interesting results. Overall I think the idea of this study is good, and its empirical analyses are appropriate. The paper, however, was not well written. In many places, the discussion is not well organized and is not sufficient; the logic is not clear; and the authors' line of thought is hard to follow. There are lots of grammar mistakes throughout the paper. My specific comments and suggestions are listed below. I hope the authors would find them helpful.	Corrected
Specific comments:	The English writing must be significantly improved before the paper can be published, perhaps with the help of a professional editor. There are lots of grammar mistakes throughout the paper. I would just list three examples here: (1) In line 37, "are of import" is incorrect. The correct expression should be "are of importance" or simply "are important." (2) In line 57, the subject of the whole sentence is missing; "we" must be added before "shows policy makers..." (3) In line 302, "where are they located" should be corrected to "where they are located."	Corrected



SDI Review Form 1.5

Title and abstract	The title does not seem to be appropriate. Most of the study is about the spatial patterns of illiteracy and unemployment respectively, with only a small portion talking about the spatial correlations between the two. The current title is misleading because it makes the readers to think that the focus of the whole study is the spatial correlations between illiteracy and unemployment. Therefore I suggest that the title should be changed to “Spatial patterns of...” or “Spatial analyses of...” The abstract is too long. The author should shorten the abstract and make it as concise as possible. Readers can get the details from the paper. I suggest that the author removes the first and the third paragraphs in the abstract.	Corrected
Introduction (<i>Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?</i>)	Yes, the objective of this study is original, important and well defined.	
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	The references cited are relevant, adequate, and comprehensive.	
Materials & methods (<i>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</i>)	The methods used in this study are appropriate and have been described in much detail. The statistics on UR in 2006 reported in line 150 is inconsistent with those reported in line 48. I suggest that the author split this section into two sections, on “Data” and “Methods” respectively.	Corrected
Results & discussion (<i>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?</i>)	1. Yes. 2. Yes. 3. The author should do a better job in relating their policy suggestions to the data and results. E.g., I do not see how the policy suggestions in the last paragraph of Section 4 are linked to this study’s	Corrected



SDI Review Form 1.5

	empirical results. The discussions and interpretations of results are generally weak. E.g., spatial correlation between illiteracy and unemployment is an important topic in this study. The author expected that there would be significant spatial correlation between the two. However, the data shows the opposite. Thus it is important for the author to discuss the potential explanations for this result and its policy implications. 4. Yes. Yes.	
Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?	No.	
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)	Yes.	
References		