



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_47821
Title of the Manuscript:	Impacts of Coal Stockpile on Soil and Water
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)

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	<p>The references are old, with no reference newer than 2013. An updated literature review is needed. For instance, coal and energy statistics should be updated e g using https://www.bp.com/en/global/corporate/energy-economics/statistical-review-of-world-energy.html</p> <p>To save efforts, the review might relatively quickly be narrowed down to coal piles. Recent literature includes air pollution effects thereof https://www.nber.org/papers/w23417 . Spontaneous combustion might be important and its history should be mentioned http://coalcombustion.com/Webpage%20PDF%20Files/Presentations%20and%20Papers%20pdf%20files/PRB%20Coal%20Degradation.pdf</p> <p>The site for sampling must be specified. For instance, agricultural soil has a different depth profile and absolute level of organic matter than forest soil.</p> <p>The method for organic matter determination in soil could not be found, nor the digestion method for Pb and Cd</p> <p>Some indication of uncertainties is necessary, e g as error bars in figures</p> <p>The soil concentration of lead is 10-100 times lower than in most other soils. A reason for this discrepancy should be given; if the digestion has been for available metal then the table in 2017 should not be used for comparison since it refers to total metal</p> <p>For the water concentration, the filtering is critical and its method should be specified. The Pb and Cd results seem a factor of 1000 too high - typically they are stated numbers in the figures but in units of microgram per liter which translates to ppb, not ppm</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Language and editing need to be reviewed, e g articles, parentheses, verb tenses (e g in line 132 followed by should be following), space between number and unit, spelling (e g line 161 productin), line breaks (e g line 177)</p> <p>Results can be compared with other recent Bangladesh results https://doi.org/10.1186/s40068-017-0101-x</p>	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gunnar Bengtsson
Department, University & Country	Sweden