



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_48722
Title of the Manuscript:	An assessment of noise levels in Sylhet City Corporation, Bangladesh
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>In this paper authors differentiated noise levels of Sylhet City Corporation, a growing city of Bangladesh into different types according to the land use purpose of the city like residential, silent etc. One hundred and sixty-eight noise level readings, taken at 14 different positions during the morning, afternoon, evening, and night of selective weekdays which are categorized as busy days, typical days and weekends were utilized for this research. Results put the average noise level readings in the city centers at between 45 dB(A) and 95 dB (A), dissented from the permissible limits of the World Health Organization (WHO) as well as national standardization organization,</p> <p>Authors results show that one-way ANOVA test is get completed where the dependent variable was noise and the independent variable was land use types uncovers a factually huge mean noise levels over the study area ($F(4,115) = 9.52, p = 1.1079$). Tukey's HSD method also carried away which showed the uneven difference of noise levels between the land types.</p> <p>Following Explanations are needed:</p> <p>Page 7: Authors are advised to re-write Conclusion with point wise.</p>	Reviewer commented that I should re-write the conclusion into pointwise which I have re-written and highlighted as well. He also suggested improving the language which I have tried my best as the same thing suggested by another reviewer too (1st one).
Optional/General comments	<p>Manuscript is interesting and structured properly, but need to be improvised linguistically.</p> <p>The review manuscript is recommended for publication after incorporating above suggestion / comments.</p>	

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)	