

Interactive comment on “Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon in urban soils of the Eastern European megalopolis: distribution, source identification and cancer risk evaluation” by George Avtandilovich Shamilishvily et al.

George Avtandilovich Shamilishvily et al.

george199207@mail.ru

Received and published: 31 October 2017

a) The language is partly insufficient. It should be helpful to get the revision of a native English speaking person. - We will b) The abstract is too long. - Abstract was shortened according to suggestion. c) there are not related literatures in many expressions. d) Too many references (around 75). Some references are cited only once and they can be replaced by others.

- Reference list was shortened, analogous references were removed

C1

Specific comments

Line 33-35: you should list the related literature(s) for your expression.

- checked it.

Line 35-37

in my opinion, not all PAHs should be classified as POPs, such as naphthalene. - completely agree with you, we rephrased the statement and made it be more accurate.

Line 66: insert white space in 'ofreports'. - Done;

Line 66-67: what is the basis of 'thousands of reports. . .?' - Related references were added;

Line 81: km² - put 2 to upper index;

Line 276: Regarding to the methods of PAH sources, you could refer the literature by Wang (2017, pedosphere) or Wang (2015, Sci Total Environ);

- Thank you, we found these referenses very useful. Added it to the list.

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2017-54>, 2017.

C2