



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The paper is well edited and based on large amount of collected data. It sufficiently summarizes the coal mining activity in West Virginia and its effects on the environment and population (however I haven't find indications of air-pollution, maybe it's not relevant). The authors collect and integrate information into GIS as it should be available to the decision-makers, stakeholders and the public. In addition, they analyze the temporal changes of the impact of the coal mining and propose possible solutions to the problems.	Ok Ok Good point, but was not part of the original focus of the paper. Doing it now is unnecessary
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	62 from coal field sites in southWest Virginia -> Southwest Virginia 132 Doddridge 14 7,202 -> different font type than the rest of the table 149 spatial trends at the county and water watershd level. -> watershed 165 of data matrices for socioe-conomic -> socioeconomic or socio-economic 185 study period, using ARCVIEW. -> version? 221 production, the amount distributed and those consumed internally in west virginia. -> West Virginia 252 of identical gains of 14.8 to 10.5%, there was a notable decline of 3.7.3%. -> 3.73% 388 To understand the impacts of mining on the ecosystem especially water bodies in west 389 virginia -> West Virginia	Much of the comments made here already factored in the revision with changes made Much of the comments made here already factored in the revision with changes made Much of the comments made here already factored in the revision with changes made Much of the comments made here already factored in the revision with changes made Much of the comments made here already factored in the revision with changes made



SDI Review Form 1.6

	409 Fig. 2.1 – 465 Fig. 2.5: I would indicate the operating mining sites on these maps as well. 442 deeper into its adjoining boundaries. The same can be said of others like upper kanawha 443 and those in the northern areas including upper ohio, upper wheeling and shenandoah -> Upper Kanawa, Upper Ohio, Upper Wheeling, and Shenandoah. 456 Upper Ohio 457 Shenandoah 458 Upper Ohio 466 West Virginia 513 Mud River 519 Mud River 530 southwest 578 pH 583 Twelvepole 815 pH 822 pH 849 3.3.2 -> No reference 866 3.3.3 -> No reference 911 Fig. 1.3 -> unnecessary zeros in the legend 1060 geospatial 1063 ecosystem	The sites are already indicated in the maps. To indicate the individual mines was not our original intent during the original data collection funded by an agency. Much of the comments made here already factored in the revision with changes made Much of the comments made here already factored in the revision with changes made Much of the comments made here already factored in the revision with changes made Much of the comments made here already factored in the revision with changes made Much of the comments made here already factored in the revision with changes made It does not add or change the trajectory of the paper. At the end of our research we turned over the original files to the sponsors.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I prefer maps with coordinates on the borders. Since this is a paper on visualizing data, I would like charts from the most important datasets (e.g.: Table 2.2, 3.1, 3.2). It is much easier for the reader to see the temporal changes. A summarizing map after Fig. 2.2 – 2.5 showing the changes of the impaired streams in time (e.g. different color or legend), would be a nice example of the further advantages of GIS.	It is unnecessary and uncalled for, Some tables 2.0 -2.1 have been cut and reduced based on the comments of other reviewers about the size of the paper. The information contained in the tables are in Table 3.1 -3.2 is enough in displaying change as we have done in previous papers. More so when we began this paper we had an objective and structure in mind, changing it at this minute is not our original intent and I beg that our freedom in the US to pursue and express research individually be respected under the aegis of freedom of knowledge and expression. These suggestions will add more confusions and accordingly, these sections stand as they are
---	--	---