

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_101308
Title of the Manuscript:	Noise Pollution A Menace to Learning in Typical Tertiary Institutions in Nigeria
Type of the Article	Research article/Questionnaire study

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.journalajee.com/index.php/AJEE/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)	In this paper, the authors performed a survey analysis concerning the problem of noise pollution in educational institution. Authors give a good problem definition where they explain their motivation, relevance and significance of this work. Thus, authors prove the significance of this manuscript for science community and I fully agree with it. I believe that the current article may provide a good start for further investigations on the current topic.	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I found the title to be appropriate and suitable. It reflects the main idea of the manuscript. Just it seems to have a little grammar mistake. Original title is "Noise Pollution A Menace to Learning in Typical Tertiary Institutions in Nigeria" and instead I corrected in this way "Noise Pollution A Menace to Learning in Typical Tertiary Institutions in Nigeria". Before "a manace" one should use "is" or "-"	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	The abstract is written in a good way. It considers the topic, accounts for the purpose and scope of the article, and also includes the main findings and results.	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well structured providing a framework on the required scientific level. I would not change anything.	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	The current manuscript is written in a good scientific way. Authors fully explain the methodology used in the study, the method of data collection and give good interpretations. It is understandable enough. I found this manuscript in accordance with the statistical facts and do not see any scientific mistakes.	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	In general, I am satisfied with the introduction section. Authors give good forewords to start this section and finishes it with aims, objectives, they provide a strong motivation and indicate the significance of their study. However, as for the literature, I found it a little bit minor. First of all, I recommend adding updated citations. Please add 3-4 references over the last 5 years, let's say from 2018 to 2022. Secondly, authors provide good references to explain how noise may negatively affect humans' health. That is very good. But there is a lack of Worldwide literature. Authors can add some examples (3 or 4 is more than enough) of similar works done in other countries. I am sure there are plenty of such investigations done in educational centres worldwide. And last, in this research authors applied a questionnaires study. So, maybe here they can also give an example of other empirical studies? How noise pollution can be measured? The following sentence can be added: "There are variety of techniques and methods to measure the noise pollution such as..... In addition to these quantitative measurements, qualitative analysis can be	

Review Form 1.7

	<p><i>used to investigate how people perceives noise in a given environment. It can be done through the application of questionnaires. A number of quantitative studies are only focused to identify the level of noise and its pressure, but without taking into account the peoples' perception. Thus, our study innovates because it provides a validation on the level and time of noise measurements". And in this point authors can underline why survey study is so important and useful. In this way authors can underline the research gap and propose their study to as a solution to fill this gap.</i></p> <p>I believe that in this way manuscript will appear more confident and more appropriate from the scientific point of view.</p>	
<u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<p>Maybe authors can add additional section like "Study area". They can add map of the study area and 1-2 photographs of those university where study is done, and also write 2-3 sentence about the educational centre in general. This part is not obligate. Authors may do or may not do it, it's up to them. I think that this can attract readers' attention and I just give an advise.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>I am not an English native speaker. However, as for me, the language needs some corrections. Firstly, I noticed that in several places there are grammar mistakes, such as instead of witting "and" authors write "nd". Are these mistakes due to inattentiveness? Maybe authors were too much of a harry. Nevertheless, I think that careful checking should be done. One more, I recommend looking closely to the similar words. For example, I saw the same word two times in a row. Authors can use synonyms instead.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>In general, I am satisfied with the quality of this manuscript and think that it can be published after correcting introduction section as I have pointed above (literature review).</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maryna Batur
Department, University & Country	Istanbul Technical University, Turkey