

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

Zhaleh Sedghi Noushabadi

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Congratulations to the authors for conducting an interesting study. I have some observations on some matters presented in this manuscript for improvement.

The manuscript needs major refining and rewriting after re-analysis.

In page 3: The negative impact of noise extends beyond its effect on students' literacy tasks. Other performance-related aspects, including attention, concentration, and memory, are also adversely affected. Moreover, studies have shown that irrelevant speech specifically has a significant detrimental effect on students' literacy tasks. Therefore, it is essential to refer to additional research that highlights the harmful effects of noise and its influence on students' literacy tasks.

Results (page 5): The presentation of the results needs an introductory text before directly presenting a figure.

On page 5, Figure 2 appears to be poorly designed as it lacks an axis legend, making it challenging to comprehend the intended message or data representation.

The title of Figure 2, "Comparative Assessment of Noise Levels within the University of Calabar and University of Cross River State," seems misleading. Instead of a comparison, the figure seems to depict the evolution or variation in noise intensity at different locations and the standard value.

Page 6, Title of Figure 3 (« Mediums of Noise Generation within the University of Calabar »): I suggest using the term "noise sources" instead of "mediums of noise generation."

Figure 3 on page 6 is presented without prior announcement in the main text. It is necessary to introduce the figure before presenting it.

The legend of Figure 3 (« other activities ») should provide more precision. It is important to display these other activities individually in the figure instead of combining them in this manner.

Page 7, Discussion: The section should be completely revised as it currently lacks a proper discussion. It fails to reference any other studies that have addressed noise assessment in educational or research environments elsewhere. It should explore whether the intensity of noise observed in these two study sites is higher compared to other locations and whether it exceeds the WHO standard. Additionally, the discussion should investigate potential reasons for the higher or lower

intensity of noise observed in these study sites compared to others.

Regarding the first line of the discussion on page 7 (« The findings show that generator noise, socio-economic activities, extracurricular activities within tertiary institutions, traffic within and outside the school premises, and business outlets within and outside the study locations are the main sources of noise pollution within the study location »), these mentioned sources (socio-economic activities, extracurricular activities, traffic, business outlets, etc.) are not adequately represented in the presented results. Therefore, it is recommended to be as precise as possible by specifying and individually categorizing the "others" under the respective noise sources.

Page 7, Discussion: The current section requires a complete revision to ensure a comprehensive discussion. It overlooks referencing any existing studies that have examined noise assessment in educational or research settings elsewhere. It should investigate whether the noise intensity observed in these two study sites is higher compared to other locations and whether it exceeds the WHO standard. Furthermore, the discussion should explore potential factors contributing to the variations in noise intensity between these study sites

Page 7, Discussion: The section needs a thorough revision as it lacks a proper discussion. It fails to refer to any other studies that have examined noise assessment in educational or research environments elsewhere. It should explore whether the intensity of noise observed in these two study sites is higher compared to other locations and whether it exceeds the WHO standard. Additionally, the discussion should delve into possible reasons for the higher or lower intensity of noise observed in these study sites compared to others.

Regarding the first line of the discussion on page 7 (« The findings show that generator noise, socio-economic activities, extracurricular activities within tertiary institutions, traffic within and outside the school premises, and business outlets within and outside the study locations are the main sources of noise pollution within the study location »), these mentioned sources (socio-economic activities, extracurricular activities, traffic, business outlets, etc.) are not adequately supported by the presented results. Hence, it is advisable to provide more precise categorization and individual breakdown of the "others" under their respective noise sources.

The inclusion of Plate 1 on page 9 appears out of place and lacks proper context. It is unclear why this photo is included and where it is introduced or mentioned in the text.