



## SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

### PART 1:

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AIR_25819</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>'For the Love of the Environment' Reflections on Professional Music Practice and Climate Change in Nigeria</b>
Type of Article:	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>General remarks</p> <p>The revised paper is only a partial answer to the suggested revision after the first submission. mistakes do still appear in this resubmission: a lot of inconsistency in the use of punctuation marks, many grammatical errors and even incomplete sentences, bad referencing style and even missing references, and so on. This is not at academic standards and hypothesizes the whole paper. The list of references in the alphabetical list at the end of the paper, especially, is below all academic standards (no alphabetical order, no consistency in the style of referencing, missing information, etc.).</p> <p>Apart from these concerns, most of the criticisms that were formulated with regard to the first submission have been answered at least to some extent. This makes the resubmission stronger than the first submission but the general impression remains that the paper is not yet at academic standards. The argumentation and some claims are still somewhat gratuitous and are not yet grounded in a sufficient body of theoretical and empirical research. There is still a conflation of arguments (deterioration of the environment and sound pollution as a causal factor for climate change). What should be at least a hypothesis (loud sound may be causative of climate change), is not developed very strongly as an argument. The hypothesis, however, is very challenging, but the arguments that are put together are not yet convincing.</p> <p>The style of writing, further is very circumstantial, redundant and trivial at some moments, which hampers the rhythm of reading .As such, I am not convinced that the resubmitted paper is ready for publication in its actual, revised state. As the editorial decision is not in my hands, I list up some detailed comments, in order to be helpful, once again, to improve the overall quality of the paper. I had hoped, however, that the resubmission should have provided more convincing answers to the first list of general and detailed comments.</p> <p>As the resubmission is in a format without numbered lines, I attach also the word document with comments added as tracked changes.</p> <p>Some additional remarks. The English language use is not yet idiomatic. Some very awkward constructions, many grammatical inconsistencies and incomplete sentences. Especially the use of punctuation marks could be improved a lot.</p> <p>The abstract is not what it should be. The categories of aims, study design, methodology and results are not well described and the content of these categories is not really a</p>	<p>All the lot of inconsistency as pointed out have been corrected. The grammatical errors and incomplete sentences have been well attended to. The referencing style is now in format position. The keywords as suggested were considered.</p> <p><b>** As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.</b></p> <p><b>Kindly see the following link:</b> <a href="http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20">http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20</a></p> <p>All the conflation of arguments has been resolved and buttressed with more stronger ones.</p>



**SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1**

<p>description of what is needed. This should be rephrased considerably</p> <p>The keywords are still very trivial: music, practice. Alternative suggestions are: music and sound, environmental degradation, sound and climate change</p> <p>The use of italics to highlight some important terms can help to improve the readability of the paper.</p> <p>The use of references is still rather poor. The author(s) posit(s) a strong (and interesting) hypothesis but does not show a lof of erudition in the field. Much more references are needed to support the claims and to reach the academic standards, needed for a hypothesis and theory article.</p> <p>The figures are not all very relevant. They are somewhat redundant and the quality is not at printing quality. Some of them could be deleted simply without hampering the main content of the paper.</p>	<p>The redundant figures have been removed and other more relevant figures are added.</p>
--	---