

## ***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 #2**

Received and published: 9 October 2017

All manuscript: This study investigates 15 PAHs in urban soils from different land uses. The authors show us new data, however, it seems like a report in current version. Authors need to improve their presentation and discuss further. For example, the mechanisms of PAHs accumulation in soils, different pattern of PAHs among different land uses and the source analysis, etc. Specific comments: 1. Line91-94: It is not the aim of this study. It is what author did in this study. 2. Don't only leave the figure caption in text. 3. Line147: Figure 2 is not necessary. 4. Why measured 15 PAHs not 16 PAHs? 5. Check figures. 6. Line 237-246: Figure3 and Figure 4 are repeated. And

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



this part should be moved to source analysis. 7. Line266-275: Authors don't need to state the details of other studies in text due to they are showing in Table 4. 8. Figure 5 and Table 5 are repeated. The resolution of figure 5 is not enough. 9. Line 287-306: Authors state the weakness of diagnostics ratios. So, did author have confidence of the conclusion deduced by this method? 10. Line 310-321: Authors suggest no significant difference in total PAHs among different land uses, which is not consistent with many other studies. I can understand there is no difference in total PAHs. However, the authors should discuss more about the difference in PAH compositions or PAH patterns among different land uses. 11. I don't think it is appropriate to draw figure 7 based on 9 sites.

---

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

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

