

Review of: "Regulatory Compliance of PCDD/F Emissions by a Municipal Solid Waste Incinerator: A Case Study in Sant Adrià de Besòs, Catalonia, Spain"

Girivyankatesh Hippargi¹

¹ National Environmental Engineering Research Institute

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This is a short article focused on health concerns due to emission issues of toxic pollutants such as heavy metals and polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins and dibenzofurans arising from municipal solid waste incinerators in Adia de Besos, Catalonia, Spain.

I have the following suggestion for the author to improve the article –

The title 'Regulatory compliance of PCDD/F Emission..' does not provide justice to this article as it doesn't provide much more precise data on regulatory compliance. So, I suggest 'A case study of PCDD/F emissions from MSWI in Sant ... Spain' is an appropriate title.

The writing style is not appropriate, and the grammatical errors are too many. The author may please focus on improving the writing quality of the manuscript.

Abstract

Write the full abbreviation of TEQ. Please include the same at the first entry instead of latter or in the middle.

What is the m in 250 m, 500 m, 750 m? The author should be clear on every point.

What is the CCMS in NATO/CCMS?

What is TCDF? There are many such words that are incorporated without abbreviations and meanings.

Where is the calculation of each PCDD/F compound detection? How were they detected? What were the methods and instruments? Which instruments are used for the detection of PCDD? How were the samples for the testing collected? All these parts are crucial to understanding the overall concept. The author should be clear on every aspect; only including citations is not sufficient.

Words like 'this sounded strange to us' need to be removed from the manuscript.

Where are the graphs/charts and tables of the study, which are key parameters to understand the concept and the trend of emission without going through complex text.

Include labels in Fig. 1 to understand the values.

I have not seen a risk assessment except for a few data from the reported paper. Moreover, many portions are unclear. How was the cancer risk calculated? If it is already reported, then where are the details.

Fig. 2 provides only specific year data from 2014 to 2017 and does not provide the details as per the included text claim from the year 1998. The figure data also doesn't provide clues about carcinogenic and non-carcinogenic risks.

The author should be clear on the conclusion – ‘the sentences like MSW itself is not a good or bad process of waste management’ is a neutral sentence and does not provide any conclusion. This kind of word is not suitable as it does not provide a precise conclusion.