

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_122319
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀) Concentrations in Educational Institutions within South City Corporation, Dhaka, Bangladesh
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The subject matter being discussed could provide a new contribution to improving air pollution in urban environments, particularly in South Asia. The focus on educational institutions is particularly significant, given the vulnerability of children to air pollution.</p> <p>Furthermore, the paper effectively emphasizes the significance of addressing air pollution in educational institutions, particularly in a heavily polluted city like Dhaka, which is critical for public health, especially for children.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title accurately reflects the paper's contents and main ideas. Also, it emphasizes the assessment of particulate matter and the zone-based analysis.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract should briefly mention the methodology, highlight the key findings, and emphasize the significance of the study's contributions. Adding a final statement about the potential implications for policy, health further research would make the abstract stronger.</p> <p>The paper does not explicitly discuss the limitations of the study, which is a critical aspect that should be addressed. Please add the limitations and implication of the research.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be appropriately organized, following a logical flow from introduction to conclusion. Each section effectively contributes to the overall narrative of the research, ensuring clarity and coherence throughout the manuscript. However, the author needs to include subsections on limitations, implications, and future studies to further improve the paper and provide a more comprehensive analysis.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The Research Method and Design and analysis is well explained. The author of this manuscript collected and analysed data providing it an air of scientific reliability and technical correctness. It is conceptually suitable and trustworthy for measuring PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} levels in various educational institutions using Aeroqual S500 monitors.</p> <p>The discussion effectively interprets the results, highlighting the excellent performance of the proposed model and its potential impact on improving air pollution in urban environments, particularly in South Asia. The statistical analyses show a comprehensive and objectively supported interpretation of the data, including the use of ANOVA to assess the significance of differences in particulate matter across different zones.</p> <p>Furthermore, the manuscript's conclusions are bolstered by pertinent research, so enhancing the study's insights into air pollution in urban educational environments.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>:</p>	<p>The citation method is correct. The reference list matches the specified guideline of the journal.</p> <p>The authors could consider adding more references that specifically deal with interventions or solutions to reduce particulate matter in urban areas. The author could support the finding and discussion part by including more references.</p> <p>We suggest developing more deeply the discussion (have to focus on analysis and interpretation) on</p>	

Review Form 3

	the results. Please describe how to support your explanation and make it clear.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The format and language are easily understandable, however, there are some minor errors and areas (Introduction and Methodology) sections where the flow can be improved for better readability.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Overall, the paper is well-organized and written with a clear structure, However, some sections with a revision for clarity as discussed could improve more the study.	

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:	Wali Mohammad Waseq
Department, University & Country	Parwan University, Afghanistan