

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_93712
Title of the Manuscript:	WORKERS EXPOSURE TO VOLATILE COMPOUNDS IN COOKING GAS AND PETROL STATIONS IN EFFURUN AND ENVIRONS
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:

(<https://www.journalajee.com/index.php/AJEE/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the Fig 1: The Proposed Categorization Decision Tree for VOCs, the symbols used need to be appropriate. (For example, decision block needs to be vertical square)</li> <li>The manuscript does not seem to be 'research article' as such. The readings taken just compared with OSHA standard where 'analysis' part is missing.</li> <li>In proposed solutions nothing is suggested about greenery (as natural trees are good absorbers of such toxic gases).</li> <li>This manuscript looks like simple project report about one situation, we may not able to generalize the findings.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recommended to identify and list the parameters compared and list all the values of these parameters in tabular format for better comparison.</li> <li>While reaching to conclusion, it was expected to have 'inferential analysis' because based on sample data you are generalizing / inferencing / concluding about situation. Here details about sampling techniques were expected to ensure unbiased conclusion.</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is suggested to rethink for the subject (title) itself. For example "Comparative study of....." Because you are comparing the values with OSHA standard.</li> <li>It is suggested that abstract should not have detailed data. It should give generic background and specific about research work. The data &amp; details can be there in annex. This will improve readability and flow.</li> </ol>	

### PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Satish Chinchorkar
Department, University & Country	MITWPU, India