

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

Jiping Zhang

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

General:

1. The paper discusses about the vegetation belt effect on road traffic noise control.
2. The writing formation satisfies this journal.

Suggestions:

1. The main references are not new and enough. For example, "The WHO recently estimated that traffic noise could conservatively account for over one million health years of life lost annually in the European Union and Western European countries (Mishra et al., 2010)".
2. "Using a sound frequency recording app (Arduino science journal), the readings at two point, one next to the road and one after the vegetation, was taken. e The results are compiled and reported." , if it took at the same time or simultaneously when the measurement was done at the two points? Or if the app has a terminal more than two channels. The measurement could be done with formal equipment and sensors which could be introduced in a more detailed way in the paper, including calibrating. The general mobile phone could not be suitable or applied in scientific experiment with the functional adjustment for clearly listening so that the results maybe not original. The reviewer was not sure if the authors did it with such an app. Maybe one kind of them could devised precisely with some isolated special sound sensors which could be introduced as the instrument as detailed as possible in the paper.
3. In order to do the assessment, the measuring results could be expressed in indexes such as LAeq or Ln. Although the concept of physical descriptions and intensity of the noise were expressed in some Arab digitals in the paper, they were not expressed in details. That is, what indexes used in the paper, dBA or dB at different frequencies in an average way or transient? And much more, the coupled results could be collected into tables in the paper to show and compare. It is not now as in the attached figures without units. And the traffic flow could be numbered with different types of vehicles, volumes, speeds, and accelerations or blowing horns near/at the traffic signals in the measurement at the same time to express the noise impact. The positions of the traffic signals could be indicated. Noted, the coupled digitals could not be compared directly, since the digital at the farer position contains an effect from distance decay beside the vegetation effects.
4. In the figures, it is short of the scale to judge the distances between the coupled measuring points. And the data are short of unites or meaning and the lasted time in the measurement.
5. The paper looks like a good home work but not a formal research paper. In the literature, there are a lot of relative

works for the noise control using vegetation, and this paper has no new findings compared with those in the references. So the reviewer suggests the paper could not be accepted. Of course, if the authors have an interest to expand it as a formal paper, the deep improvement is encouraged.

6. Because this reviewer is not a native English speaker, the comments are only on professional sights but not on language questions or problems.

Result:

Not accepted.