



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_25819
Title of the Manuscript:	'For the Love of the Environment' Reflections on Professional Music Practice and Climate Change in 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>General remarks</p> <p>This is an interesting paper which covers a field of research that did not yet receive much attention. It combines an anecdotal style of description with theoretical grounding and the style of writing is relatively fluent, though there are some minor typos.</p> <p>The beginning of the paper is very strong and attention capturing. The claims are also very challenging, but after the introduction the style of augmenting becomes weaker. Many claims are taken for granted without providing arguments. In order to be acceptable for publication, the author must provide much stronger grounding for his/her claims. Now there is a conflation of several arguments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) sound pollution can lead to hearing loss (2) sound power is a causal factor for global warming (3) Sound and noise are an integral part of environmental pollution. <p>There is no problem with the first and third claim. The second claim seems to be the strongest claim in the article, but it is very hypothetical and speculative and the argumentation that is provided is not sufficiently strong. The power emitted by music is very weak and it is doubtful whether this can have an influence on global warming. The claim, however, is challenging, and is worthwhile to be studied. The arguments that are provided, however, are not yet convincing. If the author</p>	<p>The paper has been reworked upon with stronger argument as specified by the reviewer.</p> <p>The conflation of several arguments has been sorted out with stronger arguments.</p> <p>The second claim has been removed and stronger arguments have been given to the other two claims.</p> <p>I have done all the corrections as pointed out by the reviewer in all the lines as indicated</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>wants to retain this claim, a stronger argumentation and additional empirical evidence should be provided. If not possible, the other claims can given more weight, but then the main goal of the paper is weakened considerably as these claims do add something new and substantial to what is already known. Another claim is that noise pollution is an additional element of environmental pollution, but not a causal factor for climate change. If the latter could be shown more convincingly, this could be a major point.</p> <p>The style of writing should also be more academic. There are some very old references, and some major references are secondary sources (cited in ...). The primary sources should be provided at least for an academic article. There are also many inaccuracies in the referencing style which is not uniform throughout the paper and in the list of references (e.g. use of : or , after the name of the cited author; place of the date in the reference list; use of full first name or abbreviated first letter, and so on). The author should also make a distinction between main text and references or footnotes. Information regarding references should not be inserted in the main text, but in the reference list. Citations should be reserved for subject matter with an additional value. The quality of the pictures is very low. Most of them cannot be used in their actual form.</p> <p>Detailed remarks</p> <p>Abstract: last sentence is extremely long and difficult to read. Line 44: explain shortly the terms “frequency bias” and “grating” Line 48: collapse as outcome of exposure to pipe organ: is there a reference that can testify of this</p>	<p>The style of writing has been improved upon and current references have been cited. References with ‘cited in’ have been given primary sources. The referencing style as specified has been followed. The qualities of the pictures and plates have been improved upon with detailed referencing.</p>
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>event?</p> <p>Line 56: the claim that loud sounds are related to global warming is a very strong claim, but the arguments are lacking and are not sufficiently strong; much more evidence must be provided in order to make this claim acceptable for critical readers</p> <p>Line 68: Is it possible to add a third column to the table with values of African countries for comparison with the second column which is for Western users. This could be a very useful addition to a table which is now mere common knowledge. Adding additional sources, such as churches and mosques can be also interesting to prove that the decible scale for African countries is significantly different from western scales even with additional categories. If these values are not available, own measurements can be inserted and be specified as such.</p> <p>Line 83: “the paper then examine” should be “the paper then examines”</p> <p>Line 86: title is not sufficiently clear</p> <p>Line 87-93: what is the relevance of this paragraph; rather confusing; what is meant with “there are great academis and artistic interests in the arts (???) an dthe environment”? This is not clear and seems to be rather weak as an argumentation.</p> <p>Line 89: delete first name and abbreviation of second first name of cited author: Wallace instead of Richard L. Wallace in order no to hamper the rhythm of reading.</p> <p>Line 95: same remark</p> <p>Line 98: “emissions with alternative” => “emissions for different methods”?</p> <p>Line 99: substitute “compact discs” for “compact disc”</p> <p>Line 105: substitute “ a study group has focused” for “has a study group focused”; where is footnote 3?</p> <p>Line 108: the relation of noise polution with climate change is not clear</p>	<p>The last sentence of the abstract has been recast. All the lines pointed out in the entire paper have been restructured.</p> <p>The third column has been created values of African countries for comparison with the second column which is for Western users.</p>
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Line 111: substitute “taken” for “taking”</p> <p>Line 112: put the reference in the reference list at the end of the article or in a footnote</p> <p>Line 113: substitute “embark a public” for “embark on public”</p> <p>Line 116: same remark as for line 112</p> <p>Line 119: add references for this claim</p> <p>Line 123: quality of the figure is not sufficient to be published</p> <p>Line 125: the transition to climate change is not clear here; it seems that the examples relate more to environment pollution than to climate change; the same for line 132</p> <p>Line 137: can you provide exact numbers for the wattage of the emitted sound to make your claim stronger?</p> <p>Line 141: depersonalize style: “a” participant observation rather than “my” participant observation</p> <p>Line 147: reference to Marcuse is missing in the reference list at the end of the article</p> <p>Line 149: environment in Africa. Yet, the threat ...</p> <p>Line 152: the acoustics of a worship auditorium</p> <p>Line 152: sentence is not complete</p> <p>Line 157: acoustics. Acoustics... Echo (same word at very close vicinity)</p> <p>Line 159: add blank space after channel. Also at other places this happens occasionally.</p> <p>Line 161: provide primary source rather than “cited in”</p> <p>Line 162: A vibrating body, a medium and a receiver: the latter word may be confusing as it may refer to the human receiver; perhaps another word (resonating body?)?</p> <p>Line 164: vibrations are strong ... and get weaker with distance from the source</p> <p>Line 166: Generally “it” can be taken as 340,29 m/s (rather than 300 m/s)?</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Line 169: "ratio" rather than the "ration"</p> <p>Line 170: wanted to the unwanted signal</p> <p>Line 172: 1976 is a very old reference</p> <p>Line 172: sound waves, once generated, move through the air</p> <p>Line 176: As such, there is a strong ...</p> <p>Line 177: weak argument, try to make it stronger</p> <p>Line 178: is made to vibrate and are then transmitted to</p> <p>Line 182: this paragraph is a literal repetition of line 176 ff. Please check carefully</p> <p>Line 190: noisy when it is played</p> <p>Line 191: it then becomes unpleasant to the human ear. Can you generalize this? Additional reference to strengthen this claim?</p> <p>Line 195: assert that until the third century China used noise</p> <p>Line 197: noise was considered grievous because</p> <p>Line 200: Schaffer: provide primary source</p> <p>Line 202: Van Leeuwen: same remark</p> <p>Line 203: is not typically African</p> <p>Line 204: the acoustic nature of African instruments</p> <p>Line 213: Green 2005 p 6: compare this referencing style with line 200: Machin 2000:116. Please be uniform, also for all other references.</p> <p>Line 214: Thérberge: provide primary source</p> <p>Line 216: restrictive rather than functional laws?</p> <p>Line 218: end result of all this?</p> <p>Line 221: footnote 4 is missing</p> <p>Line 222: several meters or kilometers?</p> <p>Line 223: since these...</p> <p>Line 234: loudness takes up social ... [what?]</p> <p>Line 236: and is also conditioned</p> <p>Line 237-238: weak argument</p> <p>Line 241: There seems to be also a war of sounds</p> <p>Line 242: to win more converts or to show</p> <p>Line 244: you are referring to "this research", but that</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>research is not explained, but only referred to in a very vague way. Improve the standards of description.</p> <p>Line 245: the volume of music or of the preacher's microphone</p> <p>Line 259 ff is a literal repetition of lines 255 ff. Please check carefully</p> <p>Line 268: two identical figures; redundancy</p> <p>Line 280: the sentences seems to be not complete, please rephrase</p> <p>Line 280: quality and relevance of pictures?</p> <p>Line 287: Variety of sound systems is to be found in the variety of ...</p> <p>Line 289: used improperly as they can cause</p> <p>Line 289-290: hearing ... hearing. Echo.</p> <p>Line 295: Delete first names of Schesse. Reference is missing in the reference list.</p> <p>Line 298: setting of four: explain the units used</p> <p>Line 300: the use of the headphone is becoming most popular</p> <p>Line 300: Nigerians, especially, youths ...</p> <p>Line 300: this practice, however, is also found among</p> <p>Line 302: Many Nigerians are not</p> <p>Line 303: This action is probably a result of</p> <p>Line 303-304-305: sentences are not correct; please rephrase</p> <p>Line 305: relevance of picture?</p> <p>Line 380: Senturia: old reference</p> <p>Line 313: to affect the user?</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- style of referencing must be made uniform- substitute primary sources for secondary sources- quality of figures must be improved- correct grammatical errors and some typos- some references, cited in the text, are missing in the reference list- footnotes are missing May be reconsidered is the main argumentation is made stronger	The style of referencing has followed the SDI format. All grammatical faults have been made right. All the missing references in the text have been included. The footnotes are all included.
Optional/General comments		