

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

Maria-Angels Llabres-Morey<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universitat de les Illes Balears

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

Good morning,

First, it is a good investigation, and there is a lot of work behind it; however, to improve it, I am going to point out certain aspects. The organization of the text is fine, but some sections need to be improved.

**ABSTRACT:** The abstract is a brief representation of the entire work, so it is better if the sections of the entire article do not appear; rather, a somewhat brief text (200 words or so) that synthesizes the whole idea of the article well.

**INTRODUCTION:** It would improve the part about the authors; there is little similar research or research related to the subject, and some are too old. In recent years, a lot of research has been done; you can review research in similar climates, in environments such as universities, etc. More bibliography will help to compare with your work. The issue of the explanation of pollutants becomes a bit heavy; it would be better to explain them in a table in a more summarized way, and thus importance is given to the literature. The WHO guidelines are indicated as regulations that mark the limits; it would be good to see the values that mark as acceptable, in addition to reviewing if there are local or state regulations, and all these numbers in a table to compare them.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS:** It is a bit disorganized. In the study area part, more illustrations of the situation could be included on a map (different vicinity), and the quality of the illustrations could be improved, as well as taking pictures of the university itself and the measurement sites; this also helps visually. Data such as the year of construction of the UNIVERSITY, the m2, may also be of interest, as well as the situation and climate of the area. The measurement procedure is not necessary; it would be better to write it in a more general and technical way, not as a list (it seems that you are following instructions). It is also important to make it clear why you selected these pollutants, because in the introduction it talks about NO<sub>2</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, which are important; however, they have not been measured. Some photographs of the equipment used. Is point 2.2.3 unfinished, or is it that the subsequent points are not correctly numbered?

**RESULTS-DISCUSSION-CONCLUSIONS:** Reorder these last points because the information is getting messed up.

**RESULTS:** The tables could be complemented with graphs to correctly understand the information.

**DISCUSSION:** In the discussion section, we try to discuss the tables of the results presented above. What you have written is rather the conclusions. Points 4.1. and 4.2. would be better in results, and reorder the information of this last point. Point 4.3. refers more to discussions.

CONCLUSIONS: What you have presented needs to be improved. As I mentioned before, you can use the discussion as conclusions, but you should reorder and rewrite it so that the entire research is concluded synthetically.

Some points are missing, such as acknowledgements, conflicts of interest, contributions, etc.

That's all. It is research of great interest that, with the right format, can be accepted in very important scientific journals.

Thank you.