



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The current version of manuscripts is improved compared with the previous one; it has potential to publish in British Journal of Applied Science & Technology. Here are some issues need to be revised before it accept by the journal. #1. Although as authors' mention in Authors' response "... the figures are as good and clear as presented, <u>this is not a beauty contest</u>. Some Tables...", I still convinced a good articles need a good data presentation because of it will bring a lot of confusion to the readers; therefore some figures in the current version of MS still needs some revision. Such as: In Fig. 1, map scale is kilometre is better than the meter in the current version; Fig. 3, fig4, fig5... the map scale, and letters on the map is vague, and it's hard to see clearly, kindly check and revised the rest figures. Fig. 11, 12 and 13 will be better to join together into one figure #2. the references presentation in the MS need be checked according to the Instructions for Authors. Such as ... works of Merem and Twumasi[9,10,11,];[12][13][14];[15];[16,17,18,19];[20,21,22] and Merem[23]... #3. Although the author emphasize that the MS is focus on Geospatial Analysis, however the whole MS is describe the phenomenon of environment changes (Mountain Top, Land Use Streams and Species) of West Virginia cause by coal mining, and lack of Geospatial Analysis. Therefore, delete "Geospatial Analysis" from the title "Geospatial Analysis of Coal Mining Impacts on West Virginia's Environment" will be better to match the article.	Accordingly, some typo errors were corrected in the abstract with the addition of duration. Page 1 The following lines 31,page 1 saw the retention of the word state. Line 32 page 2 consequently added , line 37 page 2 revised, line 126 page 5 water deleted, line 295 page 10 recurrent corrected. Other corrections include line 440 page 16 hazard, line 452 page 16 habitats, line 657 page 19 scenario .line 687-690 page 20 revised. Line 742 page 21 from/be, line 742 page 21 to removed The paper was properly revised and stands on its merits. I was asked to revise the map in Fig 1 before and a completely new map was created. Now a new one is added again. On Figs 3-5, they are okay and in tune with the original intent of the paper. The data in Fig 11-13 came from the source and as a result, the request placed here is not possible. Doing otherwise will completely change the trajectory of the analysis and the paper. This is a sponsored research and it is based on the agreements and the MOU with sponsors #2. Reference presentation checked , it is in line with the instructions for authors, however a slight medication on Such as ... works of Merem and Twumasi[9,10,11,];[12][13][14];[15];[16,17,18,19];[20,21,22] and Merem[23]... was done. #3. Geospatial deleted from the title as suggested and a revised title of "The Analysis of Coal Mining Impacts on West Virginia's Environment" adopted.