SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JERR_61619**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Noise pollution in Nigeria's institutions of higher learning: a review**
Type of the Article	**Review Article**

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty'**, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment***(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**1.1 Based on the referred manuscript, there are no graphs or charts are showed for better understanding of various noise levels.** **1.2 Graphs must be shown with real time parameters to determine best practices of noise and sound levels through defilement levels in different areas.** **1.3 Real data must be showed and matched with the reported in the table.** **1.4 There is no such baseline data in this study. The various threshold levels determine by WHO is mentioned. Experiments must be shown to understand it better with baselines. No real time values shown in the referred paper.**	Charts and Graphs have been added accordingly Graph indicating real noise values has been provided Real data have been provided Baseline data are compared accordingly
Minor REVISION comments	2.1 Missing figures, diagrams, real parameters, experimental values and labels.	Experimental values have been supplemented
Optional/Generalcomments	3.1 Additional data to provide much clarification is needed. Preferred use of graphs, labels and diagrams would be an additional advantage.	Supplementary data with charts and graphs have been provided accordingly

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	Nil