



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_35744
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of elemental pollution in roadside dust northeast of Nairobi major highway and at Thika town, Kenya
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>)

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	Description of procedure for dust sampling and preparation was ambiguous; one composite sample analyzed couldn't produce two different sets of results. This looks like a fundamental error. Thus, authors should work on this section of their work so as to make their results valid.	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Abstract Study design: Dust samples were collected on along ----- to read Dust samples were collected along -----</p> <p>Methodology: Authors should consider writing their methodology as suggested: Dust samples were collected at Roysambu bus terminal along Thika highway and at Thika town. The samples were prepared for analysis according to USEPA method 3050B and analysis of Al, B, Na, Mn, Cr, Cu, Pb, Co, Mg, Fe, Ni, Ca and Zn in the samples was carried out using an inductively coupled plasma optical emission spectrophotometer. The results obtained showed that there was moderate pollution by Pb and Mn, while the samples were extremely polluted by B was as computed using the index of geoaccumulation. Metals Cr, Mn, Pd and Zn were in levels similar to those reported around the world.</p> <p>Conclusion: Authors should consider writing their conclusion as</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>follow: These results showed that roadside along the highway are more polluted than those inside the town, probably due to the high vehicular number. In addition, heavy metals may pose a health hazard to people exposed to roadside dust.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Page 1, Line 15: associated with air pollution. ----- to read: attributed to air pollution. -----2. Page 1, Line 16: year where about 23 per cent ----- to read: year with about 23 percent -----3. Page 1, Line 17: Per the World Health Organization, ----- to read According to the World Health Organization, -----4. Page 1 line 19: ----- More than 80 per cent of people to read ----- More than 80 percent -----5. Page 1 line 34: Per Yu <i>et al.</i>, 2003, ----- to read According to Yu <i>et al.</i>,-----1. Page 2 line 4: These vegetable ----- to read These vegetables ----- <p>Materials and methods</p> <p>Study Area</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Page 2 line 55: ----- Thika town which one of the ----- to read ----- Thika town which is one of the -----1. Page 2 line 9: ----- and it an oil..... to read --- and it is an oil2. Authors should include in their text that the study area is represented in Figure 1.3. Authors should make the Map of River States----- Figure 1. <p>Dust sampling and preparation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Page 2 Line 61: ----- one of the bus terminals along ----- to read: ----- one at the bus terminals along -----2. Page 3 Lines 63 – 66: ----- About 300 g dust composite sample composed of 3 sub-dust samples was collected on the pavement by sweeping using a clean plastic brush and dustpan [11], during July of 2016. The dust samples were air-dried in open air in the laboratory at room temperature and sieved through 125 µm stainless steel mesh wire ----- <p>Query: Careful reading through these lines revealed that the authors only made use of just one composite sample for their analysis, whereas, they were expected to make use of two representative samples, one for the samples collected along the bus terminals along Thika road i.e Roysambu at Kasarani and the other</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>one for the samples collected at Kwame Nkrumah road in Thika town. Therefore, the authors should re-write their dust sampling and preparation procedure to reflect the fact that two different composite samples were analyzed in order to validate their results and discussion.</p> <p>Results and discussion Authors were not to demonstrate that they made use of two different samples for their analysis under materials and methods section, therefore the results presented in Tables 2.2 and 2.3 for the concentrations of the elements along Roysambu and Thika roads are not valid. Therefore, authors should re-write their dust sampling and preparation procedure to reflect the fact that two different composite samples were analyzed so as to validate their results and discussion.</p>	
Optional/General comments	None	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Falusi Bamidele Ayodeji</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Chemistry, Federal College Of Education (Special), Nigeria</i>