



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_7066
Title of the Manuscript:	Geospatial Analysis of Coal Mining Impacts on West Virginia's Environment
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	(1) The origin of Fig. 1.1 should be indicated in figure caption. (2) Fig. 2.1 – Fig. 2.5 are unclear. (3) There are some spelling and grammar mistakes in this paper. (4) GIS is not an approach. It is a tool. So I recommend the authors to revise their expression about GIS in this paper.	The origins indicated in the revisions The figs have been magnified enough for clarity based on available space The paper has been edited and corrections made Indicated and captured in the paper
Minor REVISION comments	(1) While considering the changing trend of impaired streams from 1996 to 2004, it had better to overlap Fig. 2.1 – Fig. 2.5 and label the changing area with different colours using GIS, so that the changing trend can be better exhibited.	We have already identified and analysed in space where impairment or change occurred, it is enough based on the original intent of the paper.
Optional/General comments	This paper employed statistical data and remote sensing images to analyze the environmental impact of coal mining in West Virginia. This research is interesting and important from the view of ecological and environmental protection.	Ok and I completely agree, there is no doubt the paper stands out on its own merits