

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_97709
Title of the Manuscript:	SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF NOISE FROM RELIGIOUS HOUSES IN RUMU-OKWACHI COMMUNITY, RIVERS STATE, NIGERIA.
Type of the 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.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/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)	<p>the abstract is more like a conclusion, it is overloaded, long and contains things that should be in the part of the conclusions</p> <p>In terms of the scientific research methodology, it fulfills the conditions, there are different data tables, comparisons The number of used literature should be increased I propose that the paper be sent to reviewers who are competent in this field and make their evaluation for the truth of the conclusions and if the paper should be accepted for publication</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shpetim Rexhepi
Department, University & Country	Mother Teresa University, North Macedonia