

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_83049
Title of the Manuscript:	NOISE POLLUTION ATTENUATION BY ROADSIDE TREEBELTS IN AND AROUND COIMBATORE
Type of the Article	Review Articles

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.journalsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/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	The topic of this paper is interesting, and the research is valuable. However, there are some grammar errors shown in this paper. I have already revised the Abstract and the first three paragraphs for the author. I hope the author can revise the following parts. I recommend the software Grammarly. It can revise some fundamental grammar errors in your paper. A good journal should be written in a very professional scientific thinking and language, so I recommend the author organize the whole context logically and revise his paper according to some reputational SCI journals (with high impact factors).	
Minor REVISION comments	For the conclusion part, the author concludes that "Development of suitable green belts in areas vacant in urban areas or along highways helps to reduce noise pollution." According to Figure 1 shown in this paper, the tree belt in Manikara zapota looks pretty good. Therefore, if the author can point out what kind of tree belt or what characters of tree belt has the better solution for the noise and how much percentage (%) increased for these kinds of tree belts will give the reader a better understanding of the topics and meaning of this research.	
Optional/General comments	N/A.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wenchen Ma
Department, University & Country	University of Nevada, USA