

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	MS_AJARR_128392
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Noise Pollution Level of Selected Orthodox Church in Khana Metropolis of Rivers States, Nigeria.
Type of the Article	Research paper

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses a specific yet underexplored issue of noise pollution within religious settings, focusing on Orthodox churches in Khana Local Government Area of Rivers State, Nigeria. By analyzing noise levels in different sections of churches and comparing them against environmental standards, the study provides valuable data that highlight the potential health risks associated with prolonged exposure to elevated noise levels. It also contributes to the discourse on sustainable urban planning and community health by identifying the need for noise control measures in public spaces. This research can serve as a foundation for future studies aimed at mitigating noise pollution in similar environments.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The title is clear but could be more engaging and specific. Consider revising it to <b>"Assessment of Noise Pollution in Orthodox Churches: A Case Study from Khana Metropolis, Rivers State, Nigeria"</b> for better clarity and impact.</p>	
<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Page 1: The abstract does not clearly articulate the broader implications of the study. The authors should consider adding how the findings might influence public health policies or church design standards.</li> <li>2. Page 1: The abstract contains several inconsistencies in word usage and grammatical tense that require correction for improved clarity and professionalism. Specifically, "Church" (Line 1) should be revised to "churches" for plural consistency; "metre" (Line 2) should be changed to "meter" to correctly reference the instrument, a sound level meter; and "was" (Lines 3 and 9) and "are" (Line 5) should all be replaced with "were" to maintain proper subject-verb agreement and a consistent past tense narrative.</li> <li>3. Page 1, Line 5: There is a discrepancy in the reported noise levels. One section mentions a range of "80.8 - 105.8 dBA and 890.0-104.4 dBA," which seems erroneous since 890.0 dBA is implausible. The authors should please clarify this data.</li> <li>4. Page 1, Lines 9-12: The authors inaccurately claims that both NESREA and the EPA stipulate a standard noise level of 55.0 dBA for residential areas. According to NESREA, the permissible noise levels are 50 dBA during the day and 35 dBA at night, while the EPA identifies 55 dBA as the maximum outdoor level to protect public health and welfare. These discrepancies must be addressed, and the correct values for each standard should be explicitly stated to ensure accuracy and credibility in the research.</li> <li>5. Page 1, Line 13: The keywords provided are too generic and do not effectively capture the scope or significance of the study. The authors should consider revising them to include more specific and impactful terms derived from the abstract, such as "Orthodox Church Noise Pollution," "Environmental Noise Standards," "Health Impacts of Noise," "Sound Level Measurements," and "Acoustic Exposure."</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript contains several scientific inaccuracies and inconsistencies, such as misquoted noise pollution standards, unclear methodology, and data discrepancies (e.g., implausible noise levels). Additionally, key elements like proper referencing, clarity in objectives, and consistent use of terminology are lacking. These issues undermine the scientific validity of the study and need to be addressed for it to be considered scientifically correct.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The referencing for [1] is incomplete and deviates from accuracy. Please revise it to: "Babisch W. (2002). The noise/stress concept, risk assessment and research needs. <i>Noise Health</i> 4: 1-11," adhering to the reference style you have used throughout the manuscript.</li> <li>2. For reference [4], the cited WHO (2005) report, "Adverse Health Effects of Noise. Guideline for Community Noise," has a downloadable PDF available online. The authors should include the link to the document for easy access and verification by readers.</li> <li>3. The referencing for [6] is incomplete and inconsistent with proper citation standards. The correct format should be: "Ana GRE, Shendell DG, Brown GE, and Sridhar MKC (2009). Assessment of Noise and Associated Health Impacts at Selected Secondary Schools in Ibadan, Nigeria. <i>J Environ Public Health</i> 2009: 1-6." The authors should please revise the reference accordingly to ensure accuracy and consistency in the manuscript.</li> <li>4. The referencing for [8] is incomplete and inconsistent with proper citation standards. The correct format should be: "Baloye DO, and Palamuleni LG (2015). A comparative land use-based analysis of noise pollution levels in selected urban centers of Nigeria. <i>Int J Environ Res Public Health</i> 12(10): 12225-12246." The authors should please revise the reference to include the full details, ensuring accuracy and consistency in the manuscript.</li> <li>5. The reference for [10], "Impact of Local Government Corruption and Mismanagement on Primary Education and Primary Health care in Rivers State. Human Right Watch. Retrieved 17/7/2007," is incomplete as it lacks a source link. The authors should provide the appropriate link to the referenced document to ensure accuracy and allow readers to verify the information.</li> </ol>	

Review Form 3

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>6. The referencing style for [11] is inconsistent with the rest of the manuscript. The correct format, adhering to the manuscript's style, should be: "Abulude FO, Fagbayide SD, and Akinnusotu A (2018). Assessments of noise levels from noise sources in Akure, Nigeria: A preliminary study. <i>Iraqi J Sci</i> 59(4C): 2195-2210." The authors should please revise this reference to ensure uniformity and consistency in the manuscript.</li><li>7. The reference for [12], "Environmental protection Act. (EPA.) (2013). 'Noise pollution.' Environmental protection agency. -10-28. City of Portland, Oregon. Audito, Retrieved 2013," is incomplete and lacks a source link. The authors should provide the appropriate link to the referenced document to ensure accuracy and allow readers to verify the information. Also, the year of retrieval does not substitute for the year of publication.</li><li>8. The reference for [14], "Faroqiz Zhabir, zeeshan M., Neeshan N, Murtaza G, Hussain M.M and Ghan M.U (2020). Vehicular Noise Pollution. Its environmental implications and strategic control in Autonomous vehicle and smart traffic Intec open.," is incomplete and inconsistent. The authors should provide the full and accurate information as follows:</li><li>9. "Farooqi ZUR, Sabir M, Zeeshan N, Murtaza G, Hussain MM, and Ghani MU (2020). Vehicular noise pollution: its environmental implications and strategic control. In <i>Autonomous Vehicle and Smart Traffic</i>. IntechOpen."</li><li>10. The reference for [15], "WHO 2009 Night Noise Guidelines for Europe. World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe, Copenhagen," is incomplete as it lacks a direct link to the source. The authors should provide the appropriate URL to ensure readers can access and verify the information.</li><li>11. Using only 16 references for a study of this nature is insufficient, given the complexity and interdisciplinary scope of noise pollution research. Typically, such studies require a more extensive literature review, often citing 30-50 references to ensure comprehensive coverage of relevant works. The authors should include more references, especially recent studies, to strengthen the credibility, depth, and context of the research.</li><li>12. The authors may want to refer to and cite relevant studies by Orikpete et al. on environmental noise measurement and mapping in a similar community in Rivers State, Nigeria. These works include detailed analyses of noise impacts, regulations, and perception in comparable contexts, such as:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Orikpete, O. F., Leton, T. G., &amp; Momoh, O. L. Y. (2021). Exploring the perception and impact of helicopter noise: A case study of Mgbuoshimini community, Nigeria. <i>Scientific African</i>, 13, 1-16.</li><li>• Orikpete, O. F., Leton, T. G., Amah, V. E., &amp; Ewim, D. R. E. (2020). An assessment of the impact of helicopter noise: Case study of Mgbuoshimini community, Nigeria. <i>Journal of Earth and Environmental Science Research, SRC/JEESR-120</i>, 3.</li><li>• Orikpete, O. F., Leton, T. G., &amp; Momoh, O. L. Y. (2020). Measurement and mapping of helicopter noise: A case study of Mgbuoshimini Community, Nigeria. <i>Journal of Critical Reviews</i>, 7(19), 4633-4652.</li><li>• Orikpete, O. F., Leton, T. G., Momoh, O. L. Y., &amp; Okwu, M. O. (2021). Appraisal of industrial and environmental noise regulation in Nigeria and its impact on sustainable national development. <i>International Journal of Scientific &amp; Technology Research</i>, 10(09), 92-103.</li></ul></li></ol>	
--	---	--

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>No, the language quality of the article is not suitable for scholarly communication. It contains numerous grammatical errors, awkward phrasing, and inconsistent terminology, which hinder clarity and professionalism. Significant editing is required to meet academic standards.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Page 1, Lines 14-15: The sentence, "Environmental noise is on the increase size on daily bases within our society due to human activities both commercial and industrial activities within the cities either small or big of the country," contains multiple grammatical errors and awkward phrasing. A clearer and grammatically correct revision could be: "Environmental noise is increasing daily in our society due to various human activities, including both commercial and industrial operations in cities of all sizes across the country."</li> <li>2. Page 1, Lines 15-16: Replace "Noise are" with "Noise is" to reflect the correct grammatical structure, as "noise" is an uncountable noun. Also, phrases like "unpleasant sound, unwanted sound or unfriendly sound" are redundant and weaken the narrative. The authors should streamline for better readability.</li> <li>3. Page 2, Lines 6-7: The assertion that environmental noise pollution ranks as the third most hazardous form of pollution, following air and water pollution, is not universally supported. According to the World Health Organization (WHO) and the European Environment Agency (EEA), noise pollution is identified as the second most significant environmental cause of health issues, surpassed only by air pollution (Source: <a href="https://www.eea.europa.eu/themes/human/noise/noise-2/#_ftn1">https://www.eea.europa.eu/themes/human/noise/noise-2/#_ftn1</a>). The authors should correct this statement and provide the accurate reference.</li> <li>4. Page 2, Line 10: The term "Societal noise pollution" is unconventional and lacks clarity. The authors should consider replacing it with a more commonly recognized term such as "community noise pollution" or simply "environmental noise pollution" to ensure accuracy and better alignment with standard terminology in noise pollution research.</li> <li>5. Page 2, Lines 21-23 &amp; Page 3, Line 1: The statement contains two critical issues: firstly, the quoted values (20.0 Hz to 20.0 x 10<sup>3</sup> Hz and 45.0 dBA to 60.0 dBA) lack proper citations, which undermines the credibility of the claim. Secondly, the statement conflates two ideas that should be separated into distinct sentences for clarity. The authors should consider revising it as follows: "The human ear is more sensitive to sound levels at frequencies between 20.0 Hz and 20.0 x 10<sup>3</sup> Hz. This sensitivity level depends on the individual's proximity to environmental noise pollution sources within the range of 45.0 dBA to 60.0 dBA." Ensure that proper citations are provided to support these values.</li> <li>6. Page 3, Lines 1-5: The statement, "The environmental noise limit of 80 dBA will unsympathetically affect the human's ears, while limits greater than 130 dBA are considered harmful to humans ear," contains inaccuracies and lacks proper citations. According to the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), exposure to noise levels at or above 85 dBA can lead to hearing loss if experienced for more than 8 hours. Additionally, sounds above 120 dBA can cause immediate harm to hearing. Therefore, the thresholds mentioned in the statement are not aligned with established guidelines. It is crucial to provide accurate information supported by reputable sources to ensure the credibility of the manuscript.</li> <li>7. Page 2: While the introduction highlights the health impacts of noise pollution, it lacks specific references to noise in religious settings. The authors should include recent studies focusing on noise pollution in similar environments.</li> <li>8. Page 3: The introduction section fails to explicitly state the aim of the study, which is a critical omission. Every research study must clearly define its objective to guide the reader. The authors should consider adding a concise sentence at the end of the introduction section explicitly outlining the aim, such as: "This study aims to evaluate the noise pollution levels in selected Orthodox churches in Khana Local Government Area and assess their compliance with environmental standards."</li> <li>9. Page 3: The study area description is brief and does not explain why Khana Local Government Area was chosen. The authors should expand on this, emphasizing any unique characteristics that make it significant for noise pollution studies.</li> <li>10. Page 4: The map included in the manuscript has two critical issues: first, it should be labeled as Figure 1 rather than Picture 1 to align with standard academic formatting. Second, the source reference [10] cited for the map is inaccurate, as the map was not found in the referenced source. The authors must clearly state the correct and verifiable source of the map or replace it with an appropriately sourced and properly referenced map.</li> <li>11. Page 5: Inconsistent terminology is observed in Page 5, where "noise meter" is repeatedly used in Lines 3, 4, and 6, while "sound level meter" is correctly used in Line 2. For accuracy and consistency, the term "sound level meter" should be used throughout the manuscript, as it is the proper terminology for the instrument described.</li> <li>12. Page 5, Line 6-7: It is unclear whether the sound level meter was calibrated before use. The authors must include details about calibration to ensure accuracy.</li> <li>13. Page 5, Lines 10-11: The choice of 15 sections within the church for measurement is not explained. Justify this sampling strategy by discussing its representativeness.</li> <li>14. Page 5, Line 8: All measurements were taken during Sunday services. Are there no activities during other weekdays? The authors should discuss whether these findings can be generalized to other times or activities.</li> <li>15. Page 5, Lines 9-10: The methodology mentions taking three readings per point but does not clarify the intervals or specific conditions (e.g., variations in crowd size or activity levels). Elaborate on these aspects.</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 3**

	<p>16. Page 6-7: Tables 1 and 2 present extensive data but lack proper statistical analysis, such as standard deviations or confidence intervals, to indicate variability and reliability.</p> <p>17. Page 6-7: The results are compared against the EPA standard for residential areas. The authors should justify why this standard was chosen when the environment (church) is non-residential.</p> <p>18. Page 11: The discussion reiterates results without offering deeper insights into the causes of observed noise levels or their broader implications. The authors should explore socio-cultural practices or architectural factors contributing to the noise levels. They should also include comparisons with noise levels in other religious or non-religious settings to contextualize findings.</p> <p>19. Page 12, Line 8: The discussion briefly mentions health risks but does not connect them to specific demographic groups or noise exposure durations. The authors should please address this gap.</p> <p>20. Page 13, Line 1: Recommendations like "provision of noise-absorbing structure" lack specificity. Suggest concrete interventions, such as specific materials or architectural modifications.</p> <p>21. Page 13: The conclusion does not outline future research possibilities. The authors should propose studies on noise mitigation strategies or longitudinal health impacts.</p> <p>The manuscript does not explicitly disclose any competing interests. However, the lack of a declared conflict of interest statement raises concerns. The authors should include a formal statement clarifying whether any competing interests exist to ensure transparency.</p>	
--	---	--

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Ochuko Felix Orikpete</b>
<b>Department, University &amp; Country</b>	<b>Centre for Occupational Health Safety and Environment (COHSE), University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria</b>