

Review of: "The Impact of Study Environment on Students' Academic Performance: An Experimental Research Study"

Kamaladdin Abedi¹

¹ Kurdistan University of Medical Sciences

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I would like to thank the authors for putting all their effort into preparing this article. The study aims to assess the impact of noise on the performance of the students. The title and the content of the manuscript seem attractive and scientific, but there are still many shortcomings in the article that need to be edited as follows:

- The objective of the article is to investigate the effect of three environmental factors (noise, lighting, and temperature), but only noise has been mentioned and focused on in the manuscript.
- The introduction looks fragmented and disjointed and requires to be more consecutive, coherent, and connected. The literature review is so long and needs to be more concise and abstract. Also, it should be included in the content of the introduction and not appear in a separate and independent form. Moreover, it is necessary to refer to more previous works. Furthermore, the hypothesis needs to be put in the content of the introduction in connection to the other paragraphs. Finally, the introduction section suffers from the weakness of expressing the problem and the necessity of conducting the study. Therefore, a major revision is recommended for the introduction section.
- The methods section suffers from the weaknesses of lack of good English, lack of a sequence of steps, and a detailed description of how the study was performed. How was the study designed? How were the noise and other parameters measured? What were the conditions of the study environment? How did the authors determine the validity and reliability of the data acquisition tool? Etc.
- The results section looks so weak. There are no tables and graphs expressing the data. It is not common in a scientific article to write down the detailed formula and calculation of the t-value and p-value. The results section is so short. The first paragraph in this part should be moved to the methodology section.
- The discussion is so abstract. There is no analysis of the data, no comparison to the previous reports, and in general, it needs a major revision. The recommendations part is so long and needs to be more concise and be included in the discussion part as a paragraph. It looks like the control methods are the objective of the study and not the impact of the environmental parameters on the performance of the students from the discussion section. Therefore, a major, accurate, and scientific revision is recommended.