

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_87657
Title of the Manuscript:	INDOOR AIR POLLUTION IN RUMUEWHERA COMMUNITY IN OBIO-AKPOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF RIVERS STATE, NIGERIA
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.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>More care is needed over claims</b></p> <p>"Indoor air quality depends on the type of energy used, time spent cooking, house structural features and ventilation habits for households (opening of windows and doors)." how do you now this. It was not clear that these things had been measured and don't feature in the Spearman test.</p> <p>More critical is the use of the spearman test in the paper. It is not incorrect, but what does it show I guess it tells us that CO correlates with PM. I guess much as expected. It is obvious and seems not that important</p> <p>The big question is: what is the difference between fuels? Is biomass/wood the worst? You could use a one-way ANOVA but the data set is small and not normally distributed, so a Kruskal-Wallis Test would be better. I copied the morning CO data into an online calculator. I chose Vassarstat - a <a href="http://www.vassarstats.net/">http://www.vassarstats.net/</a></p> <p>Ordinal Data Kruskal-Wallis Test for k=3 with na=9; with nb=4; nc=4. i.e. for Wood Gas Kerosine I ran the morning CO and got P=0.0168 and mean ranks for Wood Gas Kerosine as gave 12 ,3.5 and 7.8 - rather satisfying and suggested gas was best and wood worst. Not a bg data set, so statistics is poor, but convincing nevertheless. I thin the authors should do something like this.</p> <p>Typography needs to be more carefully used. PM2.5 and PM10 should be non-subscript or subscript throughout to be consistent. Variable such as <i>p R</i> etc must be italic</p> <p>Lots of odd spaces in many lines early in the paper.</p> <p>Liquefied Petroleum Gas is defined as LPG. Then later is as LPGas. Be consistent</p> <p>and 39.38 + 13.2765µg/m3 a space is always needed between numbers and units and don't be excessive in the use of significant figures, surely 13.28 would be mre than enough accuracy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amended as "Indoor air quality in rural communities is a function of the type of energy used for cooking, kitchen configuration and the time spent in cooking"</li> <li>Kruskal-Wallis Test has been used to collaborate the spearman test results.</li> <li>Typographic errors have been corrected</li> <li><b>LPGas corrected to LPG</b></li> <li>Space amended <b>between numbers and units.</b></li> </ul>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>More care is needed over claims</b></p> <p>"This study can be used to raise awareness of the health impacts of indoor air pollution in rural communities and to reduce the mortality rate of women "It is not clear how the study might be used to raise awareness in a rural community" Academic results of this kind might be less useful than a demonstration of the three types of cooking to local women showing how clean the air felt might be more influential or showing different ventilation techniques ton them.</p>	Amended as follows: "This study demonstrated the presence of CO, PM <sub>2.5</sub> and PM <sub>10</sub> at concentrations which may impact women and young children due to exposure during cooking in rural communities."
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Important, even though well studied topic.	OK

### 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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	No Ethical issues