

# Review of: "Research question: What effect does vegetation have on sound pollution in Delhi?"

Issa Al Harthy<sup>1</sup>

1 Sultan Qaboos University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Research question: What effect does vegetation have on sound pollution in Delhi?

The title should not be as a question. The title does not reflect the content of the project accurately; authors should revise it to reflect on the main objective of the review, and most importantly, state clear findings on the major challenges and strategies of the perception and disturbance of sound.

#### 1. Abstract:

Abstract needs to be injected with purpose of the research, the important of the work and and the main outcomes

## 2. Background

Background is lacks of enough and deep background related to the topic. I suggest to have three major sections the first one is a background where authors highlight the importance of topic and general introduction about noise and health exposure. The second section is literature review where deep and comprehensive review is required here with recent publication in well-known Journals in the topic. The third section is about recommendation and future task.

Aims and Objectives

Authors have to <u>state the clear objectives of this study</u> at the end of the introduction section, and provide the significance of this review study to the scientist community and for policy applications.

Methodology

The **research methodology does not** discuses or explain the data collection and analysis methods that used in the research. I think the author should revise the Methodology section because it is a key part of his research paper. The methodology should explain what he did and how did it. It should include:

The type of research you conducted

How he collected and analyzed the data

Any tools used in the research

Mitigating or avoiding and obstacles that can affect the readings or any others issues.



And Why he chose these methods

## Results and analysis

The paper seems descriptive rather than scientific review of the perception of noise. Authors <u>should</u> include "Discussion" section, and discuss the results of the findings with the relevant literatures, provides recommendation on how these traffic noise reduced by vegetation.

## Tables/ Figures

Authors should improve the resolution of the Figures.

Tables of findings should be presented in the paper; however, this paper is lack of tables.

## Conclusion

The conclusion of this paper seems to be very short. The authors should include a variance findings, provide recommendations on how to avoid the limitations that were found during the work and how could be improved.