



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 (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	The author attempted to discover the relations of Coal Mining and Environment changes by using Geospatial Analysis; from this side it has a merit. However the whole manuscripts just describe some phenomena of Coal Mining and Environment issues of study area, due to lack of real Geospatial Analysis. The author needs a significant work to do before it go ready to scientific journal. (1) All the tables and figures need to recode as Table 1, 2, 3....; Figure 1, 2, 3. (2) Figure 2.0 to figure 2.8, is not clear for appearance, and some tables are not present well, such as Table 2.0, Table 2.1. (3) The whole paper is too long and tedious and need to be reorganized. (4) INTRODUCTION: The paper describes the information of coal production in improving the state's revenue and destroys the environment, it lacks of analysis of Geospatial Analysis method or GIS using in analysis the above issues. Why we use Geospatial Analysis? Which merits of GIS and Geospatial Analysis have, in analysis of Coal Mining impact on environmental issues? (5) MATERIAL AND METHODS #1 This part is too long and tedious, we just put the key information in here is OK; also for Section 2.2 Methodology, using the flow diagram will be better. #2. We need a clear view of the data sources, i.e. Line: 137-142. Such as, which data in the paper come from the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)? And which data in the paper come from the USGS? #3. Figure 1.0 should given a location in the Map, i.e. where is it in the map of America? (6) RESULT #1 The title of the Section does not match with the text, for example ,in	We have made revisions as other objective reviewers have said correctly and the paper stands out on its merits. Significant revisions have been made from the abstract, the size and reverences and citations. 1) Tables and figures recoded, 2) the figures are as good and clear as presented. Some Tables were removed and the rest consolidated and presented in a better way. 3) The paper has been reduced from 30-26 by 6 pages and is completely reorganized 4. We have already stated the merits of GIS, and added more with extensive information on the introduction The paper is clear on the use of GIS in the context of environmental impacts of coal mining and its stands as is. The merit of GIS is indicated in the paper as we have always done. 5. 1-We have reduced and revised this section, there is no need for diagrams, 2- The data sources are captured in the citations and references and figures. 3- Fig 1 location of WV has been indicated in the new map of US. 6. The section is revised under the heading of result; there is nothing wrong in indicating the use of coal, even though environmental analysis is deleted, what is wrong with it? The reasons given by the reviewer are unfounded. #2 see the definition in the appendix on acronym,



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Section 3.1, the author just describes the profiles of coal production and distribution of Virginia, it has nothing to do with “Environmental Analysis” #2 In section 3.5 The Spatial Analysis, the author need to mention the definition of Spatial Analysis? How to use the Spatial Analysis method in analysis the impact of coal mining in environment? And what results get from such analysis? However author just describes the phenomena of locations of Wetlands, mining sites and impaired streams. It is just a kind of expression of data not a Spatial Analysis. #3 A quantify relation of coal mining and environment issues (pollution, land use even MTR) need to be built in the paper.	it is irrelevant and unnecessary. The questions being asked are irrelevant and misleading and have no basis in the paper. We have already made persuasive case and analysis of impairment, # 3 the question is irrelevant and not the intent of the paper and it will not be so because it has no merits and logic
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	#1 Combine with Section:1.1 Background Information and the Issues and 1.2 Purpose and Organization into one section #2 Reorganized the Section: 2.1 The Study Area, we need to put the key information in here, not all the information. #3 Put figure 2.0, 2.1 into Section 2.1 The Study Area	Already taken care of in the revisions Already taken care of in the revisions Already taken care of in the revisions Already taken care of in the revisions
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		