SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Applied Science & Technology**
Manuscript Number:	**2015_BJAST_18466**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Urban Noise Pollution in Nigerian Cities: Imperatives for Abatement**
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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI Review Form 1.6

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	The writing of the paragraph beginning on line 86 should be reviewed: -Sound intensity would not be expressed in Watt but in Watt/m^2. -What is expressed in dB is sound pressure level or sound intensity level. -The 0 dB is linked to the hearing threshold at 1000 Hz, but young people usually can hear sound pressure levels of less than 0 dB (see, i.e., reference audiometric databases on ISO 1999:90). -An equation or formula is expected to appear on line 97 but only a part of it appears on the pdf I have received. On paragraph beginning on line 390, it is important to establish that acoustic green barriers only are effective when its thickness is of at least some tens of meters.	
Minor REVISION comments	Including some general data and figures as total population or extension of the urban area when the case of study is presented, will be useful for the reader. It is important to establish if the question on table 2 was the first one of the survey. This is to know if the respondents have been previously asked about other issues or if they have been introduced at once to noise-related questions. Some references have been missed, especially on the first	

	paragraph of the introduction of the paper and when legislation issues are mentioned (Noise abatement measures section). The references for experts and researches mentioned on lines 111-113 are also needed. Egunjobi's report is included in the references but it is not cited along the paper. Authors of the reference on line 431 are Berglund B., Lindvall, T. & Schwela, D.H.	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Anonymous**
Department, University & Country	**Universidad de la República, Uruguay**