



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_35877
Title of the Manuscript:	Determination of sulfur dioxide dispersion in the atmosphere from petroleum production Unit No. 9 and its proximity to Masjid-I-Suleiman
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 (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The paper deals with the problem of determining the amount of dispersion of SO₂ in the atmosphere in proximity to Masjid-I Suleiman. The authors focus on a good and interesting environment issue. However, the reviewer expects more detailed introduction in order to give motivation of the paper. A number of current journal papers on the air pollution also were not mentioned. They should be cited for the readers. Especially, the last paragraph of the Introduction is not prominent. "Data presented in this work can help to determine the most polluted areas in Masjid-I Suleiman" reflects the paper just as a case study. Because, in this form, the paper behaves just a data collector, such as air pollutants, temperature, relative humidity and wind speed for a case study in Masjid-I Suleiman. Study area is well-described. However, the location of this information is wrong. They should have given in "Material and Methods", not "Studying Scope". Please move them to the beginning of the "Material and Methods". A map and/or a number of photographs of the study area are requested to provide information to the reader. If you mention a well-known method, approach and technique, you should be cited. While giving two methods for measuring air pollutants, please cite them. A standard conventional procedure was performed to determine the amount of sulfur dioxide as experimental procedure from July to December for eight designated locations. Please rearrange and provide the comment for the following sentence: "The results show that the maximum concentration of sulfur dioxide is 30.08 (µg/cm²/day) (December- Station No.1) which is close to oil production unit. The lowest concentration has been measured around 0.32 (µg/m² on sq. per day) why did you change units? At Station No. 5 in the same month (far from oil activity)." In this form, it is a bit confusing. The numerical values of sulfur dioxide concentration in Table 1 are different from each other. These include any outliers or gross errors. How to check it? Did you use any outlier test? Experiantal working requires the test of outliers because you have to proof that all the	Corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	errors in observation data comes from the normal distribution. At least, you can use a basic univariate model. Especially, in Table 4, some standard deviations significantly differs from the others. What is the reason? The same problem is also valid for Tables 2, 3 and 4. The reviewer strongly suggests to use a basic univariate model for checking outlying data in order to polish the paper. Otherwise, the paper only present the numerical results by the tables, it has no scientific importance. "Elâzığ (Kpunar et.al, Turkey)" is what kind of citation? In the "Dmyrychin Study in Trabzan (Turkey)", "Trabzan" should be replaced by "Trabzon". The seasonal and atmospheric effects should be discussed more detailed. The authors uses the words of station and site seperately. Have they the same meaning? If not, what is the difference between them? Please explain it. Please provide detail information about ISO 9223 Standard for the readers. What do the levels of P0, P1, P2 and P3 stand for? The same suggetion is also valid for Poland research institute. No discussion about the Table 5 in the text. In such a case, why did you give the correlation coefficient? Finally, clarify me what is the difference between Conclusion section and Abstract. All the concluding remarks already have presented in the Abstract. The Conclusions should be rewritten in order to clarify the readers if it provides the original results (!). In his form, the submitted paper is far away from the original research paper. Moreover, the reviewer is not satisfied with the language too, please ask some native speakers to polish the text for the next submission. By a careful improving of the some expressions and statements, adding some explanations and correcting some English grammar and spelling mistakes.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	A revised manuscript should be prepared based on the comments and suggestions above.	ok