Review of: "Evaluation of Ambient Air Quality Levels at Various Locations within Lead City University, Ibadan"

Wan Nurdiyana Wan Mansor[1]

1 Universiti Malaysia Terengganu

Dear authors,

1. The abstract effectively summarizes the study, but it could be more concise.

2. There is inconsistency in how sources are cited. For example, "World Health Organization. (2018)" versus "Brook, R. D. et al. (2010)." Stick to one citation style, either APA or another standardized format.

3. The phrase "The situation is particularly concerning in urban areas" could be more specific by adding, "due to the high density of pollutants from industrial activities and vehicular traffic."

4. In the section discussing ozone (O3) and carbon monoxide (CO), there is some repetition, such as the effects of CO being mentioned twice. Consolidate this information to avoid redundancy.

5. There is a minor error in the description of carbon monoxide (CO). The phrase "Carbon monoxide (CO_2)" is incorrect; it should be "Carbon dioxide (CO_2)." CO_2 and CO are different gases and should not be confused.

6. The transitions between the different pollutants discussed (PM, NO_2, SO_2, O3, CO) could be smoother. Consider using transition phrases to better connect these sections.

7. Check for grammatical errors in main objectives, which typically appear in paragraphs rather than bullet points.

8. Ensure that the tense remains consistent throughout, especially in sections describing past actions (e.g., data collection methods).

9. The sentence "that doesn't report any exceptionally high afternoon CO_2 measurements as seen in Location 13 in the present study" is grammatically awkward and would benefit from restructuring.

10. The interpretation of temperature data is mostly accurate, but the comparison with the other study (Smith et al., 2017) could be more detailed. The author mentions that the afternoon temperatures in the current study fluctuate more than those in the comparative study, which could be better explained by discussing possible causes, such as differences in microclimates or urban heat island effects.

11. Abbreviations should be used throughout once they have been introduced.

12. The author should dive deeper into potential causes of CO_2 high readings, such as closeness to pollution sources or ventilation concerns.

13. The author might also consider discussing the implications of even low levels of CO over extended exposure times, particularly in an educational setting.

14. The summary provides a good overview of the data but could benefit from a more integrated discussion that ties the different parameters together. For example, how might temperature fluctuations influence RH and PM levels? This

would provide a more holistic view of the environmental conditions.

15. Analysis improvement: Analyze how each variable changes from morning to afternoon and compare these changes. Use visual aids like charts or graphs to illustrate these differences. Point out any anomalies or outliers in the data and discuss potential reasons or implications. Calculate correlation coefficients between variables to explore relationships (e.g., between TEMP and CO_2 levels). Use scatter plots to visually represent correlations and relationships between variables.