

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	An Overview of Literature, Language and Education Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2857
Title of the Manuscript:	CULTURAL HERITAGE EDUCATION AS A TOOL FOR RESILIENCE: THE CITY AND ITS ALPHABETS
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Tourism is a prominent socioeconomic phenomenon with substantial worldwide impact. Moreover, it provides good opportunities to achieve the growth of societies while simultaneously contributing to the distribution of heritage, which entails the recovery, conservation, and appraisal of the various expressions of legacy. Moreover, it offers intercultural stimuli, evokes diverse emotions, and encourages reflection on our identity and history, while also shaping the future we aspire to achieve.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is acceptable to use the title of the article.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The article's abstract is far too lengthy; you should make an effort to describe all of the findings that are essential to the research.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	It would be more suitable to include the literature review part in the manuscript rather than the sections and organisation of the article. The hypothesis that is already being reviewed was discovered by me, and as a result, it needs to be included in the section on the literature review.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Scientifically and technically, this manuscript is solid and reliable.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	It is sufficient to have references, but they are not recent; you should make an effort to refer to sources that are within the last five years.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	However, there are certain sentences that may be difficult to understand, despite the fact that the article's English quality is appropriate for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form2](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Supparang Ruangvanich
Department, University & Country	Chandrakasem Rajabhat University, Thailand