



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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Abstract to be rewritten to cover the scope of work, methodology & major findings in less or equal to 200 words or so. 2) It would have been somewhat more practical to display Table(s) showing noise measurements in a typical mosque, church or an occasion for celebration/entertainment taken with respect to time, say in second. Thus provide a range of noise produced by noise equipment. 3) We have evidence of sentence repetition, which is not allowed (see lines 160-162 versus 171-172; and lines 178-181 versus 182-184 or so.) 4) There are cases of poor sentence constructions, see pages 139-142; 310-313, etc. 5) Use of first person pronoun e.g. "I" or "my" is not allowed in technical writing, see pages 59, 151, etc. The entire manuscript should be edited. 6) Text reference does not settle for surname and year of publication in over 50% of the references. 7) All photographs/plates in the manuscript are not given figure numbers. 8) On the climate change, as the author is not able to establish any link between noise and climate change or any relationship whatsoever. What is the justification, to include it in the title of the manuscript? See authors comment on lines 375-377. 	<p>I have worked on the abstract to be less than 200 words.</p> <p>I have added a table showing typical noise in Ile-Ife with provision on the range of noise produced.</p> <p>I have worked on those repetitions sighted in (see lines 160-162 versus 171-172; and lines 178-181 versus 182-184 or so.)</p> <p>I have recast the sentence in line 139, 142, 310-313</p> <p>I have changed the use of personal pronoun in the entire paper.</p> <p>I have worked on the referencing in line with the journal specifications.</p> <p>Figure numbers have been given to all photographs and plates in the paper.</p> <p>You may also assist me, am just a young scholar.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Note: Please see suggested corrections in yellow and those to be deleted in yellow plus cancellation line.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		