

Peer Review

Review of: "Evaluation of Musical Conductor Exposure to Noise"

John Omomoluwa Ogundiran¹

1. Universidade de Coimbra, Portugal

OVERVIEW: *The study is of interest and relevant in the context of an indoor noise exposure survey. The study offers relevant insight into the occupational risk of music conductors and potential music participants. Generally, the structure and layout of the text are well organised. The grammar could benefit from some revisions; meanwhile, the following revisional comments are suggested to enhance, clarify, and assess the novelty. If these are implemented, the manuscript is recommended for publication as a short communication.*

In the introduction/literature: *Noise is defined as unwanted sound, but in the context of the study, the conductors, band, or audience may have a different opinion regarding noise. Could you address this possibility in the discussion section? Although it is evident from the literature and findings that noise in excess of the referenced standards (NIOSH and OSHA) is inadequate, posing a risk to exposed occupants' health. In summary, what are the author's thoughts on the subjective perception of noise, especially considering the studied environment? Do they want these high noise levels or not?*

Comments: *In the methods, could the authors indicate the formula used to compute the two noise indicators, L_{Aeq} and C_{Peak} or how these were computed?*

'Another interesting point, the acoustic conditions for that musical hall could mostly reflect the high-frequency sounds generated by the music bands. This is mainly related to the reverberation of hall walls'

Comments: *Where was the study conducted, the location of the rehearsal hall or concert venue? Perhaps citing the location where the study was conducted will help clear up doubts or corroborate the note above regarding the acoustic feature of the study hall, which should be common knowledge if verified.*

Comment: *Could you clarify the positioning of the noise dosimeter? Where was it installed? Was any standard referenced, or were there specific reasons for such positioning? Was the same position adopted for both days of the noise survey?*

In Figure 1. Measured L_{Aeq} and C_{Peak} of continuous exposure to noise for 7 hours on the first day for a musical conductor during a rehearsal session.

Comment: The word 'continues' should be 'continuous'. Kindly revise the titles for Figures 1 and 2.

'What's more, ...' Although this expression is understood, I suggest the authors present the thought otherwise. For instance, expressions like "moreover" or "furthermore"

In Table 1. Results of two days of noise exposure levels, dBA/8hr, for a musical conductor during rehearsal sessions in a music rehearsal hall at a concert center.

Comment: I think this title could be much more concise without losing its essence, for instance, "Noise exposure levels (dBA/8hr) of a music conductor during rehearsals"

'These findings confirm the fact that they work directly using the sound source responsible for their own sound exposure.'

Comment: Please verify the intended meaning... Besides, do you imply their own noise exposure or sound exposure?

In Table 2. Variations of a musical conductor's noise dose per hour during the actual period of rehearsal for each day of measurement, and the activities were presented.

Comment: Perhaps a more concise table title can be achieved, as already remarked for Table 1's title.

Attachments: available at <https://doi.org/10.32388/GC2S0S>

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.