

# Review of: "Redefining borders in the contested territory between San Pedro and San Andres Cholula"

John Kelly<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Wisconsin - LaCrosse

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

You do a good job connecting past and present through the evolving spatial and functional roles of the "two Cholulas," focusing on the border/boundary between them (conceptual, legal, and physical). I have a few suggestions, mainly about more polished English:

The first time you mention "municipality," I suggest you insert "(an administrative unit equivalent to a US county)" – because "municipality" is a vague term in US English.

"Phenomena" should be "phenomenon" (singular).

"...under a regime of land tenure" is vague. I think you meant "...under a social property land tenure regime" [i.e., ejidos and comunidades agrarias].

Delete "it was considered" (unnecessarily wordy).

"...to recognize its uniqueness" doesn't make sense, and is unnecessary. Better just to say "There is no way we can separate the socio-cultural concept of boundaries from their geographical functions; they are socio-spatial devices."

Figure 2 is excellent – a clean, readable presentation of important, INEGI-derived GIS data. Nice job! However, I do not see the difference with Figure 3.

Good use of "digital newspaper" data. Figure 6 is great!

I would introduce your "spatial justice" and "borders as strategic planning tool" much earlier in the text. Really, you need a paragraph in the first page, telling us that you will use census data and news items to map underserved communities in the two counties, and relate this to the boundary area between them as a contested space.