SUGGESTIONS

Chers revues ,

Nous vous remercions d’avoir accepter notre papier. On partege avec vous les reponses apporter au suggestions du revu 1 et du revu 2 dans les ligne qui suivent.

**======= Review 1 ========**

1. Authors & affiliations arrangement: OK
2. Figures labeling: OK
3. Abstract can be improved by adding a little bit more methodology: OK
4. Please add schematic diagram for Fig. 1 : OK

**======= Review 2 ========**

1. **Data validation, it is good to validate the data found using established/ existing method used by the policy maker or other researchers.**

During the campaign, we employed various sensors, as illustrated in Figure 2. Specifically, we used the Pop Air device (Dual Laser PM2.5 particle counting), which proved essential for data validation as it complies with the standards set by the Air Quality Management Center (CGQA) of Senegal.

1. **This research covered quite huge area, meanwhile the emission concentration showed fluctuate reading depending on the activities at that specific location. Therefore, I would suggest to focus at one location and observe the trend for more thorough and in-depth research**

The analysis of data from this measurement campaign in the Dakar region allowed us to generate a map illustrating the spatial distribution of PM2.5 particle concentrations, highlighting five high-concentration zones. For a more comprehensive study of variations and pollution sources, we focused on two specific locations: the city of Dakar (see Figure 6) and the city of Rufisque (see Figure 7).

We plan to conduct a more in-depth analysis of the remaining high-concentration zones in the near future for a forthcoming publication.

3**. Methodological approach should be reporting what you have done. Please choose appropriate tenses. Overall, this paper can be considered to be accepted in this conference:** OK