

REVIEW OF THE ARTICLE

Name of article: *Determination of actual characteristic curve of main ventilation fan at underground coal mine using field measurement method*

1. Originality: Is the question original and well defined? Do the results provide an advance in current knowledge?

- Yes. The paper's results provide a new theory for determination of actual pressure characteristic curve of main fan in Quangninh underground mines.

2. Significance: Are the results interpreted appropriately? Are they significant? Are all conclusions justified and supported by the results?

- Yes. The paper's conclusions justified and supported by the results

3. Quality of Presentation: Is the article written in an appropriate way? Are the data and analyses presented appropriately? Are the highest standards for presentation of the results used?

- Yes. The content of the article is presented clearly, the data and analyses presented appropriately

4. Scientific Soundness: is the study correctly designed and technically sound? Are the analyses performed with the highest technical standards? Are the data robust enough to draw the conclusions? Are the methods, tools, software, and reagents described with sufficient details to allow another researcher to reproduce the results?

- Yes. The data and statistics are sufficient to draw conclusions on determining actual pressure curve of fan. Research method and tool are reliable for deriving results.

5. Interest to the Readers: Are the conclusions interesting for the readership in the field of earth science?

- Yes. The paper's research results are good quality and reliable

6. Overall Merit: Is there an overall benefit to publishing this work? Does the work provide an advance towards the current knowledge?

- Yes. The research results of the article are good references, Quangninh underground mines can be applied to determine the actual characteristic curve of main ventilation fan.

7. Detail comments:

- Name of the article: is it fully reflecting the content of the manuscript?
Other comments or suggestion.

Yes. The paper's name is suitable and well reflects the content of paper

- Abstract: is it properly written in the format required by the journal (a continuous passage, no line breaks)? And is it concise, fully reflecting the purpose of the paper, research methods, and main results?

Yes. The abstract fully reflects the content of paper.

- Keywords: are they suitable for index purposes? Are there any that needed to add or remove?

Yes, the keywords are suitable

- Introduction: Is it convince enough in terms of the purpose and objectives of the article? Any recommendations on addition or reduction?

Yes. The introduction well stating the necessity and objectives of research

- Study area involved in the article: Have the geologic, tectonic setting or seismicity characteristics been properly described? Any additional recommendations?

Yes, the geologic of study area have been properly described

.- Data and research methods used: The source and reliability of the data? Are the methods used consistent with the research objectives and clearly described in the manuscript? Any suggestion on addition or reduction? Other comments?

The source and reliability of the data is good. The method used in the paper is modern and highly reliable.

- Are the results presented in clear, complete and reliable forms? Recommendations (?):

Yes, they are clear, reliable and applicable to practice

- Are the charts and/or tables presented in the manuscript reflecting the research findings (quantities and units, uncertainty; are the letters readable?)

The graphs and tables clearly show the research results

- Figures: does the manuscript contains a generalized figure showing the study area? Is the resolution of the graphic illustrations good enough and is the handwriting readable?, Provide comments on legends and/or annotations of each figure, recommendations on any additions or reductions.

Yes. The figures are clearly and scientifically presented

- Discussion: are results interpreted reasonably and radically? Are results logical and convincing and are they comparable with those, published earlier? Other comments?

The results interpreted reasonably and radically

- Conclusion: is it consistent with the objectives of the article? Does it summarize the main results/findings and consistent with the points made in the commentary and discussion? Any recommendations on the future's work? Other comments and recommendations.

The article's results are consistent with the objectives and suitable with the requirements

- References: Are the references adequate and following the format required by the journal both in the text and in the list of references? Point out those references that are lack of or unsuitable for the article.

Yes

8. English Level: Is the English language appropriate and understandable?

Yes

9. Overall Recommendation (accepted without revision, minor revision, major revision, major revision with returned review, reject):

The paper can be accepted after minor revision

- The author may consider adding the location of the study area to the name of the article. If not, it will not affect the research objective, because location of the study area has been shown in the content of the article.

(Readers notice that the name of the article may be missing the location of the underground mines. Therefore, the author may consider adding)