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|
|
|
| PM 10 is measured in mg/L not micrometer. | | Change to mg/L as a concentration of PM10 |
|
|
|
| Subscript:  the n is already mentioned with NOMENCLATURE. | | Remove the n from the subscript |
|
|
|
| Figure 6, should be named as (a) and (b) to be more clear to the reader. | | New Figure number for Figure 6.  Figure 7 (a) and (b) was added to the paper. |
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