Solid Earth Discuss.,
https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2017-54-RC1, 2017

Solid Earth
Discussions
Open Access
EGU

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.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 1 October 2017

All manuscript

a) The language is partly insufficient. It should be helpful to get the revision of a native English speaking person. b) the abstract is too long. 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.

Specific comments

Line 33-35: you should list the related literature(s) for your expression. Line 35-37:

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

in my opinion, not all PAHs should be classified as POPs, such as naphthalene. Line 66: insert white space in 'ofreports'. Line 66-67: what is the basis of 'thousands of reports. . .' Line 81: km2 Line 276: Regarding to the methods of PAH sources, you could refer the literature by Wang (2017, pedosphere) or Wang (2015, Sci Total Environ)

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