

Review of: "Acoustic Over-Exposure in the Institutional Land Use of Calabar Metropolitan Area, Cross River State, Nigeria"

Ochuko Felix Orikpete¹

¹ University of Port Harcourt

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Reviewer's comments for the paper titled "Acoustic Over-Exposure in the Institutional Land Use of Calabar Metropolitan Area, Cross River State, Nigeria."

This paper provides valuable insights into the issue of noise pollution in Nigerian tertiary institutions but was very poorly presented. The paper stands rejected until the following comments are addressed:

1. The abstract is somewhat lengthy and could be more concise. It should succinctly summarize the key points, findings, and recommendations of the study. While it mentions the instruments used and the general findings, it could benefit from briefly stating the main conclusions or implications of these findings.
2. A standard paper will have: 1. Introduction, 2. Literature Review, 3. Materials and Methods, 4. Results 5. Discussion 6. Recommendations 7. Conclusion. The aim of the study should be stated more precisely and ought to appear at the end of the introduction.
3. The quantitative study ought to have been balanced by a questionnaire/survey study to determine the perception of the university community to the noise problem.
4. More details on the calibration and validation of the BK Precision 732 Digital Sound Level Meters would enhance the credibility of the measurements.
5. The discussion should more explicitly connect the findings to the study's objectives and hypotheses.
6. A more thorough comparative analysis between the two institutions studied would provide deeper insights.
7. The "summary" was totally irrelevant and should be removed. This is because the author was mentioning "chapters" in his/her "thesis" instead of "sections" of a "journal paper". The actual structure in the paper: 1 – Introduction, 2 – The Problematic (which is better stated as "Statement of the problem", 3 – Aim and objectives of the study, 4 – The Study Hypothesis, 5 – The Study Area, 6 – Method of Study (which is better stated as "Materials and Methods", 7 – Results, 8 – Summary, 9 – Recommendations, 10 – Conclusion; which grossly contradicted what was stated in the summary: Chapter 1 – Introduction, Chapter 2 – Literature review, Chapter 3 – Methods, Chapter 4 – Data Presentation and Analysis.
8. Plate 1 should either be placed in the main text or appendix.
9. The references were mostly outdated and did not follow the APA style as all letters are italicized. Only the Journal name and volume number should be italicized. DOI or source link should be provided at the end of each reference.

