

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reviews in Physics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJR2P_96115
Title of the Manuscript:	Measurement and Analysis of Noise Levels: A study of Selected Pubs in Calabar, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journalajr2p.com/index.php/AJR2P/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The manuscript is important 2. The title is ok 3. The abstract is not comprehensive and very non-technical. Authors should use technical language 4. 4. The subsection and structure need to be revisited as shown in the reviewed draft 5. The scientific content of the paper is very shallow and the authors only posted the final results without indicating formulas and relationships used for analysis. How were the graphs plotted, and which tool was used? 6. The references are insufficient, relatively old ones eventhough there had been recent researches on the subject matter. In addition, some of the references have insufficient bibliographic information. The referencing style used by the authors is not uniform. Consequently, there is the need for a grammatical check as the language is very poor for a journal publication.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is very poor. Authors should enlist the use of grammar checking tools	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Edwin A. Umoh
Department, University & Country	Federal Polytechnic, Nigeria