



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Chemical Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACSJ_22075
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE STUDIES OF CARBON MONOXIDE (CO) EXPOSURE IN HOMES USING DIFFERENT COOKING FUELS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Please review the use of the word “chiefly”. Repetitive usage in many of the paragraphs. Please revise sentence number 54. The part where it is mentioned the carbon monoxide concentration is variable. Use appropriate word to bring out the meaning of the message being delivered. Do mentioned what are the “uncertainties” in sentence number 66. It will give more credibility to the idea you are putting forward. Not necessary to mention the numerous number of the deleterious effects of Carbon Monoxide. Citation to the average number of deaths per year as well as the health effects pertaining to the research is more than enough. The researcher should make better and clearer statements on the relationship between symptoms experienced by the household members to the CO concentration being studied. The researcher also mentioned that the study location i.e Benin City, is the centre of the rubber industry as well as the palm nuts processing centre. The researcher, however, failed to mentioned if the readings obtained are in fact controlled for these confounders. The researcher should have mentioned how these factors are controlled therefore giving an independent reading of CO obtained	It is noted. The correction has been effected. The sentence has been reviewed. The uncertainties has been stated clearly. It is noted. Some effects has been expunged number 36-38 and 43-49. Noted. A clearer statement has been made in number 253-255. The history of the some the major activities of the state was mentioned as observed, however the study areas are far from where these industrial activities do occur.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	only from the type of fuel being used during cooking activities. Do mentioned what is the use of the data collected. For example, why was the age and gender of the people in the household collected. How does it help out in cementing the point that the researcher is trying to put across.	The age and gender of the people as shown in table 4 where used for medical examinations.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The researcher can limit the conclusion and only mentioned important points pertaining to the research. There is no necessity to mention the safe limit of cities like Cairo. Maps showing the study location could be a little bigger. The precise location of the study samples or their general location in the bigger map should be highlighted. The histograms illustrating the data obtained should larger as well.	Noted .
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Researcher could have included a higher number of households in his/her study. If that is no possible, researcher should have not mentioned the huge number of population in the Benin City and instead should have focused on a smaller study population.	The population in the area studied is lesser than the entire city population. The information was simply provided as part of back ground study.