

Abstract:

- The abstract is too qualitative, whereas in the report there are some quantitative data. It would be better to take some most important quantitative data to support the qualitative interpretation of the data.

Introduction:

- The structure of Introduction should be revised.
- Line 48-52 should be paraphrased as it contains redundancy
- Line 51-52 needs a reference cited
- Line 59: harsh environment conditions? Sound likes in the desert.
- Line 60-63 This sentence is more appropriate for the first sentence in the introduction
- Line 48-73: The paragraphs is too long, should be divided into two paragraphs.
- Line 66-67: information regarding “particulate matter” is not related to previous sentences
- Line 132-134 Should not be the last sentence of the introduction

Methods

- The explanation about the street name for sampling is not giving proper information regarding the position of each streets. It would be better if provided the map of the city
- Line 151: spring season is the peak season for plant growth? Not at summer season? Please give a reference
- Line 151: commonness after? What does it means?
- Line 161-162: explain the “entirely random design”
- Line 169: leaf area, length, width and LAI is not physiological parameters
- The method section also need to be rewritten thoroughly

Results

- Line 203-205 repetition from method
- Line 211-212 how to keep an eye on atmospheric pollution?
- It would be better if in the result, the performance of each plants is reported under categorized of parameters measured, in that way it would be easier for reader to compare parameters of each plant.
- Data in tables and pictures should be elaborated in the result

Discussion

- The result should be compared with other related reports and discussed properly.