Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Engineering Research and Reports**
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)*

Compulsory REVISION comments	**More care is needed over claims**
	
	"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.
	
	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
	
	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 http://www.vassarstats.net/
	     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.
	
	Typography needs to be more carefully used. PM2.5 and PM10 should be non-subscript or subscript throughout to be consistent. Variable such as *p R* etc must be italic
	
	Lots of odd spaces in many lines early in the paper.
	
	Liquefied Petroleum Gas is defined as LPG. Then later is as LPGas. Be consistent
	
	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	

Minor REVISION comments	**More care is needed over claims** **"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.**	
Optional/General comments	Important, even though well studied topic.	

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:	**Peter Brimblecombe**
Department, University & Country	**National Sun Yat-Sen University, Taiwan**