

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

Isabella Charres Fandiño¹

¹ Universidade de Aveiro

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The manuscript discussed the "**Evaluation of Ambient Air Quality Levels at Various Locations within Lead City University, Ibadan**". The objective of the article is novel and would provide important information about some atmospheric pollutants in different spaces of a university, particularly a university in Africa where few studies have been carried out to characterize air quality. However, several changes must be made to the manuscript. I would like to offer the authors some recommendations to improve their manuscript.

Materials and Methods: In general, this part is divided into many subtopics and ends up repeating information between them, and in the end, it does not include information that should be described.

Section 2.1 should have a map with the locations of monitoring sites. In addition, it is important to describe what time of year the study was carried out; was the measurement period the same for all locations (for example, were the car park and the chapel monitored 24 hours a day or in the same season or in the same week)? How many days were the premises sampled? Do all locations have the same number of samples? Were the measurements simultaneous?

Topics 2.3, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8 do not present relevant information; they could be disregarded.

Topic 2.2 could be described in another way. On the one hand, remove sections 2.2.1 and 2.2.2. On the other hand, sections 2.2.3 and 2.2.4 can be one and should include the name and temporal resolution of each of the measuring instruments used. It is also important to know the conditions under which the instruments collected the data, for example, at what height, near windows or doors, etc.

Results: I recommend excluding Table 1, as it is not a result.

Be careful with the information in the tables and figures since the units of all the parameters are missing in all of them.

There are many tables; I suggest you explore your results with more graphs (boxplots, diurnal cycles), etc.

In general, the results need to include discussion and comparison with other studies. I recommend discussing the differences between the different spaces evaluated using the statistical tests that were mentioned in the methodology.

I suggest you separate the information from section 4; this section should be focused on conclusions because there are no conclusions in the manuscript.

