

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_86268
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effect of Varying Aerosol Concentrations on Visibility and Particle Size Distribution in Urban Atmosphere: Validating OPAC Results Using MERRA Satellite Aerosol Data
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

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	<p>Once the appearance of abbreviated words in full details is urgent please recheck all text. Correct them in the abstract.</p> <p>Add one or two lines introduction to abstract keeping word count limit up to 250 words.</p> <p>Tables and figures must be referred in the text.</p> <p>We need a certain time interval of the same years for all cases studies of countries for example 12 years. The analysis of different years for nations seems wrong.</p> <p>Table 2 or 1? In the following sentence and paragraph; From table 1, it is observed that Brazil, China, India, Indonesia, United States, Japan and Mexico have α values greater than 1, signifying the presence of fine mode aerosol particles within the</p> <p>Satellite is able to collect data and monitor concentration of other gasses like NO_x, SO₂, O₃, VOCs, etc. Why did not use the data in the present study?</p> <p>Could you please notify allowable concentration of case pollutants posed in this research from WHO, EPA plus health effects of them?</p> <p>What is difference between results of MERRA and opacity? Explain clearly.</p> <p>Figure 1 seems wrong for circumstances of presentation and collecting data in one certain figure.</p> <p>Presentation data of Figures is irrelevant so try to replace it with better one.</p> <p>There is a serious difficulty with analysis of data and presentation of them. Check guide to author for allowable number of figures and tables.</p> <p>The present study does not present results of simulation.</p> <p>Conclusion chapter needs to remove redundant words and keep the key words.</p> <p>Add and collect all similar research in a table.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Malek Hassanpour
Department, University & Country	Osmania University, India