Reviewer 1

First, I thank the authors and editor for the opportunity to read this interesting work. The authors analyzed the correlation between pollen types and airborne pollutants in the paper and compared their results with two time periods. The manuscript is well-written. However, the methods section can be improved significantly. Thus, the article needs to be revised and edited before publication.

Comments:

1. The result has been driven based on 2013-2017, which is relatively old data. So, how the author(s) compensate or can assert the relevancy of the study in the present day? Please try to address it.
   Ok, done it (lines 204-207)

2. Please justify each of the tools used in the data analysis. For instance, why Statgraphics Centurion 18 was used to calculate the degree of correlation?
   Ok, done it

3. The conclusion part can be well-written.
   Ok, done it

Specific comments:

1. I would suggest deleting “and objectives” from the introduction section. Also, the study has a single objective, but “objectives” is a plural term.

Ok, done it

2. Line 83-87 and 91-93: Citation required.

Ok, done it

3. Line 248-251: Missing parenthesis

Ok, done it

4. Line 259, “left-hand column of Table 2,” can be rewritten with a clear indication of the table. These types of sentences should be well written so that audience can easily understand them.

Ok, done it

5. Tables 2 & 4: I would encourage changing the font color (red to black; white to black). Also, the value can be represented by symbols or characters in the footnote rather than using different font colors.

The authors think that the color code is clearer.

6. Line 380: This is a hanging sentence and can be merged or added in either of the paragraphs.

Ok, done it

7. I suggest splitting the “Discussion and Conclusions” section. It makes the paper clear and more understandable to the audience.

Ok, done it

8. The opening sentence of the discussion section is not appropriate. “It can be concluded that…… “ this can be concluding remarks!

Ok, done it