

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

Sanat Kr. Guchhait<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Burdwan

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

## Reviewer's Comment

### ***Title of the Paper: Redefining Borders in the Contested Territory Between San Pedro and San Andres Cholula***

The paper titled "**Redefining Borders in the Contested Territory Between San Pedro and San Andres Cholula**" by Mr .XXX is an outlook of enquiry of border between San Pedro and San Andres Cholula within the Puebla urban agglomeration – the fourth largest metropolitan area of Mexico with historical background, social context and urban development within the last 40 years.

### **Strength of the paper:**

The paper is written with a new outlook in the context of urbanization in Mexico. Following are the merits of this paper:

1. The method of enquiry is good enough but the nature of analysis is not so much strong.
2. The scholar has rightly upheld the socio-historical perspective along with ethnicity as the background of the study and recent time urban development policy, through which he (she) has made the context of redefining border.
3. The mapping technique (geospatial mappings) and the selection of variables are worthy to mention along with the lacking expressed through policy like lack of cooperation privatization. Moreover, the resultant maps are self-explanatory.
4. Highlighting comparative analysis between municipal development plan and reality of the two cholulas the scholar has added the specific reality of the study.

### **Shortcomings**

However, the paper has few lacking which are mentioned below though the scholar has mentioned the limitations (demographic analysis, economic condition of the inhabitants, understandings of the cultural activities);

- i. One important explanation required i.e., indigenous population are basically suffering. As the scholar has visited that area, the reason should be clarified (the outlook of indigenous population or the outlook of the authority to these people.
- ii. Within the major concentration of indigenous population women, children, and elderly people are suffering most that is explained but why the women population are not overlapped with children requires an explanation. Even the lack of

services is not juxtaposed with women concentrated areas (fig: 2a, 2b and 3a ,3b). So, women are not so much vulnerable as that of children and elderly population. That must be stated clearly.

- iii. Fig-5 has no legend and depiction is not clear.
- iv. Considering the figures Fig- 2 & 3, the area coverage of lacking service is high for San Pedro, while regarding vulnerable population (children and elderly indigenous population) San Andres is more critical. Those are not explicitly expressed in the paper and redefining border needs further explanation.
- v. From Fig-6, it is clear that rather than inconsistency of urban planning, privatization of land and natural resources for San Andres is more responsible whereas lack of cooperation for San Pedro is responsible for lacking. That must be stated clearly.
- vi. Therefore, depiction of fig.-6 initiates gentrification for which the redefining borders is contested.
- vii. As the gentrification is found in the depressed urban area (lack of infrastructure and services) **it needs a specific planning like hiking taxation of developed areas and welfare of the depressed areas.** The author has mentioned the statement of E. Soja but has not concluded how it is implied in this point.
- viii. As the scholar has visited the areas and has mentioned the concept of mental border of the people, therefore, the scholar can glean the perspective of mental border through word cloud (if possible) (A border is understood as a political, psychological....page 5, para-5 line 2-34).
- ix. Some important word clouds must be tabulated and it should be translated into English to make it readable.
- x. Conclusion must be modified with critical observation and planning needed thereof.
- xi. Some grammatical mistakes are found like:
  - a. **a**; a story presence of vulnerable population (page-8, para-2, line-2)
  - b. Two municipalities **is** quite blurred (page-11, para-1, line-1)
  - c. This diagnosis ..... how **a** urban.... (page-6, para- 2, line-1)
  - d. In this case of cholulas, **this phenomena** ... (page-2, para-3, line-1)

Thus, this paper requires revision regarding the aforesaid points.