

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

Mahesh Bade<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Baylor University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

## A report on "Evaluation of Ambient Air Quality Levels at Various Locations within Lead City University, Ibadan"

The authors have conducted an evaluation of ambient air quality levels at various locations within Lead City University, Ibadan.

### Few Suggestions:

Add citations wherever needed (reported a few in draft).

Try to merge the main objective, specific objectives, research questions, and scope of the study into one or more paragraphs. It looks like more repetitions.

Section 2.1: Add a figure with study area and sampling stations.

Section 2.2 is completely not in proper format.

Section 2.6: Incomplete paragraph and don't understand the importance of this section.

Section 2.7: This section is completely vague. Authors can discuss more about the instrumentation here.

Section 3: Results: Why did authors discuss sampling locations here? I don't understand.

1. Results were not clearly reported, and in most of the sentences, authors' results were the same as the literature reported. Then what is the importance and novelty of the current results?
2. What is the significance of figures 1 and 2, and nowhere was it reported?
3. No proper discussion, conclusions, and novelty in findings.

References are not properly arranged.

The manuscript has to be thoroughly revised. There are a lot of language flaws, and authors need to think about the novelty of the work. There are studies reported on similar kinds of objectives in a very science-reflected way. Authors have to look into the literature before starting to revise the draft.



I don't recommend publication in Qeios, suggesting some suggestions.