

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Applied Chemistry Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJACR_118897</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Development of Mathematical Model for Prediction of PM2.5 Concentrations in ambient air of Metal Recycling industry in Ogijo, Ogun State, South Western Nigeria</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

## Review Form 1.7

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The manuscript appears to be important for the scientific community</li> <li>The title of the article, "The Development of Mathematical Model for Prediction of PM2.5 Concentrations in Ambient Air of Metal Recycling Industry in Ogijo, Ogun State, South Western Nigeria," is quite descriptive and suitable, but it can be improved for clarity and conciseness.</li> <li>The abstract of the article is fairly comprehensive, providing a good overview of the study. It includes the aims, study design, methodology, results, and conclusions. However, it could be improved for clarity and completeness by ensuring each section is distinctly highlighted and by providing a bit more detail on the methodology and implications.</li> <li>Based on the provided excerpts, the manuscript seems to have a well-structured format that is commonly accepted in scientific research articles.</li> <li>Based on the provided excerpts, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct in terms of its approach, methodology, and analysis. In summary, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct based on the provided information. However, a full assessment would require a detailed review of the entire document, including the data, models, and statistical analyses. Peer review and reproducibility are essential components of verifying scientific correctness.</li> <li>The manuscript's references are generally sufficient and recent. However, adding a few more recent studies on advanced predictive models, health impacts, and policy effectiveness could further enhance the manuscript's comprehensiveness and relevance.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>The manuscript is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but polishing the language will enhance its clarity and readability. Focusing on grammar, syntax, clarity, consistency, punctuation, and maintaining a formal tone will improve the overall quality of the article. A thorough proofreading and possible consultation with a professional editor or a native English-speaking colleague could be beneficial.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p> <p><b>Overall Assessment and Marks</b></p> <p><b>Title:</b> "The Development of Mathematical Model for Prediction of PM2.5 Concentrations in Ambient Air of Metal Recycling Industry in Ogijo, Ogun State, South Western Nigeria"</p> <p><b>Key Evaluation Criteria:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Relevance and Importance (2 points)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The study is highly relevant due to its focus on PM2.5 pollution, which has significant health and environmental impacts. The specific context of the metal recycling industry adds value.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Originality and Novelty (1.5 points)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development of a nonlinear gamma regression model (NGRM) for predicting PM2.5 concentrations is a novel approach that can contribute to the field.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Methodology (1.5 points)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The methodology is detailed and appropriate for the study objectives. The use of</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p>multiple models and statistical validation methods is a strength.</p> <p>4. <b>Data and Analysis (1.5 points)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The data collection is thorough, spanning different seasons. The analysis is comprehensive, employing various statistical tools to validate the models.</li> </ul> <p>5. <b>Clarity and Language (1 point)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The manuscript is generally clear but needs minor revisions for grammar, clarity, and conciseness.</li> </ul> <p>6. <b>References and Citations (1 point)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The references are mostly sufficient and recent, though a few more recent studies on advanced modeling techniques could be added.</li> </ul> <p>7. <b>Ethical Considerations (1 point)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There are no apparent ethical issues, but a conflict of interest statement and a funding acknowledgment should be included.</li> </ul> <p>8. <b>Overall Presentation (1 point)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The overall structure and presentation are good, with detailed tables and figures. Minor improvements in the layout and subheadings could enhance readability.</li> </ul> <p><b>Overall Marks: 8.5/10</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation: Minor Revision</b></p> <p>The manuscript is well-structured and presents significant findings relevant to air quality management in the metal recycling industry. While the study's methodology and data analysis are robust, minor revisions are needed to improve language clarity, include additional recent references, and ensure transparency regarding ethical considerations and potential conflicts of interest.</p> <p><b>Suggested Actions for Revision:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Proofread for grammar and clarity.</b></li> <li>2. <b>Add recent references</b> on advanced modeling techniques.</li> <li>3. <b>Include a conflict of interest statement and funding acknowledgment.</b></li> <li>4. <b>Ensure ethical transparency</b> if applicable.</li> </ol> <p>With these minor revisions, the manuscript will be strengthened and ready for acceptance.</p>	
--	--	--

**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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Deden Istiawan
Department, University & Country	Tadulako University, Indonesia