



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_33248
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation and Mapping of the Noise Levels in Oil Mill Market and its Environs, Port Harcourt, Nigeria
Type of the 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Lines 59-61. The authors said: " <i>This study was therefore conducted to model and map noise levels...; and to analyze its impacts on public health.</i> ". How did authors analyse the impacts on public health? It is not clear in the text.	This is rewritten as: This study was therefore conducted to evaluate noise levels in the Oil Mill Market and Environs in Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria; and its potential impacts on public health.
	Lines 61-62. The authors said: " <i>There is inadequate research works on noise levels in market places</i> ". What did the authors mean by that? It is not clear.	The statement has been reframed for clarity.
	Figures 2 – 5. The FMEnv limit is presented as a bar chart, however, this option harms the comparison between FMEnv limit and measured values, mainly due to the use of the 3D perspective. To correct this, I recommend to replace the bar chart of the FMEnv limit by a line chart, keeping the bar chart just for the other variables.	Recommended graph format has been implemented.
	Figure 3. The figure 3 is with a different color and formatting. I recommend to standardize the graphics in the Figures 2 – 5.	Recommended graph format has been implemented.
	Figure 7. The same recommendation made for FMEnv limit in the Figures 2 - 5, but in relation to the WHO and NESREA limits.	Recommended graph format has been implemented.
	Lines 128 – 188. The discussion related to the graphics in Figures 2 to 6 is just descriptive, i.e, the authors only describe the values from measured parameters. There	This section has been worked on and a discussion section added to further enrich the article.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	is little or no analysis. At the end of each paragraph the authors only reiterate, generically and repeatedly, which the noise excessive levels can cause impacts on health public. To enrich this discussion the authors could pointing out potential health issues specifically related to the measured sound levels in the study area.	
	Lines 211 – 221. In the section “3.1 Sources of noise in the market” the discussion remains only descriptive. This discussion could be enriched comparing the result of the present paper with the ones achieved in previous studies, such as the ones cited in the introduction.	This section has been further discussed and findings compared with previous study.
	Line 231. How did authors calculated the “mean volume vehicles”? This needs to be clear in the methodology section.	Mean volume of vehicles was calculated by dividing total number of vehicles counted by total number of hours (Equation 2).
	Line 255. How did authors made the noise modeling? The authors only said how the measured has been made, but they didn't said how noise curves was made, which interpolation method and software were used. This needs to be clear in the methodology section.	The software and method used in noise modeling have been included in the methodology.
	Figure 11. I strongly recommend the use of regular intervals, wich boundaries based on integer numbers, or at most with 2 decimal places. For instance, like this: 98 – 100 ou 98.5 – 100.	The recommended noise intervals for the noise model have been implemented
	Figure 11. In addition, the use of green color is inappropriate in this case, because it seems to be representing a good sound condition and, in contrast, in the map it is representing around 98dBA, which is a bad condition. Therefore, I strongly recommend the use of a variation from yellow to red, using, if necessary, intervals with bigger size, and hence a smaller number	The recommended colour codes for the noise model have been implemented



SDI Review Form 1.6

	of intervals. For example: ≤ 100 dBA: light yellow 100 - 101.9: dark yellow 102 - 103.9: light orange 104 - 105.9: dark orange 106 - 107.9: light red ≥ 108 dBA: dark red	
	Lines 276 – 286. I recommend suppressing the item “3.4 <i>Study findings</i>” and incorporating its text in the discussion of the precedents items.	This has been abridged.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The objective of the paper was presented, but it was not explicitly stated. In this sense, we recommend using an statement like “The present study aimed to...”, in order to make the understanding easier by readers. The text is well written, but there are some typing errors. For example, see “ <i>Figures 1</i> ” in line 73 , and “ <i>identifies</i> ” in line 212 .	Adjustment has been made to the objective of the paper as recommended. Figures has been corrected to Figure; Identifies has been corrected to identified
	Line 86. I recommend using just “ <i>2.2. Data Collection</i> ” instead of “ <i>2.2 Methods of 86 Data Collection</i> ”.	Section 2.2 has been corrected to read Data Collection
	Table 3. The title is under the table, whilst in the other tables the title is positioned on top. It’s necessary to standardize.	Title of Table 3 has been placed on top.
	Line 230. In order to avoid unnecessary repetition, I recommend eliminating the expression “Figure 9” in its current position (lines 232 and 233), including it in the line 230, after “...market place (<i>Figure 9</i>).”	Figure 9 in lines 232and 233 has been expunged as suggested.
	Figure 10. I strongly recommend removing the current texture (with water aspect) in Figure 10, replacing it for one background of more sober, such as use one grey colour.	The water texture background has been removed from Figure 10.
	Lines 316 – 370. It is necessary to standardize the formatting of references.	This has been done.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		