



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The paper describes the impact of the mountain top removal due to mining. The paper is interesting but could be shortened. I believe that the four aims of the paper (lines 74-78) are excessive and are not completely reached by the paper I suggest to do not mention to the fourth aims. Unfortunately the figures, that would help the reading, they are too small and of poor quality. In the figures the coordinates must be indicated.	The paper has been reduced by 6 pages from 30 to 24 pages The aims of the paper has been shortened to only 2 I disagree with the assertion on the quality, This is what produced based on the data collected originally, there is no intention to change and it stands as is. We have magnified the maps with right resolutions in some areas. Blowing up the figures would add more pages which are completely unnecessary. Any person looking at the maps can vary them on the computer from 100% to 400% if they so desire but there is really no need for that. Does not change the trajectory of the paper
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There are some typos that show little attention in the preparation of the manuscript (West Virginia vs. west virgina; no space between the words, etc.) There are many tables, maybe some of these would be clearer if accompanied by diagrams	Much of the comments made here already factored in the revision with changes made Some tables have been deleted with extensive changes and that is actually enough, Diagrams was not original intent and there is no point forcing it. Does not change trajectory of the paper
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		