

## Review report

**BSMMUJ-17.3 – 73245**

Noise sensitivity and its associated factors among the students of Rajshahi City in Bangladesh: A cross-sectional study  
Sarker PC et al. ([pramath588@gmail.com](mailto:pramath588@gmail.com))

REVIEW COMMENTS	AUTHOR RESPONSE	
	[Note: Please write the responses to each point here mentioning line number(s). You must change the manuscript as per your response.]	
<b>A. Mechanical review</b>		
Date sent to author: <b>20-May-24</b>	Date: <b>28-May-24</b>	
1. The title page should have word counts too.	Word counts have been provided in the title page.	
2. The Abstract should be structured.	Changed to accurate structure	
3. You have only one table. Therefore, the manuscript should be shorter. For example, a Brief Article can have a 200-word abstract, 1500-word main text, 20 references, and 3 tables/figures.	We have submitted 3 tables, 210 words abstract, a 1790 words main text, and 21 references for your consideration.	
4. Submit an EQUATOR checklist also.	We have submitted the complete STROBE checklist as per your instructions.	
Date sent to author: <b>28-May-24</b>	Date: <b>28-May-24</b>	
1. Kindly revise the Introduction section incorporating the research gap and justification (highlighted). These should not be stand-alone sections.	I have followed your instructions and made the necessary changes.	
<b>B. Technical review</b>		
<b>ROUND 1</b>		
Reviewer's name: <b>Nasima Akhter</b>		
ORCID: <b>0009-0009-2345-5001</b>		
Date assigned: <b>30-May-24</b>		
Date submitted: <b>29-Jun-24</b>		
Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s? <b>No</b>		
Do you wish to be disclosed to the author? <b>Yes</b>		
Comments sent to author (Date: <b>3-Jul-24</b> )	Date: <b>7-Jul-24</b>	
	Score	[Note: Provide response/s if score is below 6]
How would you rate the originality and depth of the manuscript?	5	We revised the findings of the manuscript and tried to explain to reflect the originality of the work.
Is the manuscript written in a scholarly manner?	5	The manuscript has been revised as advised, followed the STROBE checklist and formatted based on the journal's guidelines.
Does the manuscript have the potential to make a valuable contribution to the world of knowledge?	4	We revised the findings and tried to address such points which may contribute to the world of knowledge.
Does the manuscript meet ethical standards?	5	We described the ethical issues in detail in methods section which may reflect the standard practice now.
1. Objectives of this study couldn't reflect on this study strongly.	Objective has been modified.	
2. Relation of socio-demographic variables with noise sensitivity was not clear.	Relation of socio-demographic variables with noise sensitivity has been modified accordingly.	

REVIEW COMMENTS	AUTHOR RESPONSE				
3. Most of the data was collected from classroom setting but they were residing at home, mess & hall (table 1), measurement of noise level of home, mess & hall, then population from classroom of highest noise level and lowest noise level should be included.	We conducted the study from a totally psychological perspective. We did not measure the sound level.				
4. Absence of noise indicator (Ldn-day night average sound level)	A significant amount of research has been conducted in Bangladesh on sound level measurement, but there has been no research on the psychological effects of noise. Our study aims to fill this research gap by examining the psychological impacts of noise.				
5. This study should be reviewed by a psychiatric expert/ Psychologist	This study is Reviewed by a Professor, Dept. of Psychology, University of Rajshahi. Minor revisions are made based on his feedback.				
Reviewer's Recommendation: <b>Revisions required</b>					
Reviewer's name: <b>B</b>					
ORCID: -					
Date assigned: <b>11-Jun-24</b>					
Date submitted: <b>3-Jul-24</b>					
Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s? <b>No</b>					
Do you wish to be disclosed to the author? <b>No</b>					
Comments sent to author (Date: <b>3-Jul-24</b> )					
Date: <b>7-Jul-24</b>					
How would you rate the originality and depth of the manuscript?	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="699 1120 794 1162">Score</th> <th data-bbox="794 1120 1495 1211">[Note: Provide response/s if score is below 6]</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="699 1162 794 1211">6</td> <td data-bbox="794 1162 1495 1211">-</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Score	[Note: Provide response/s if score is below 6]	6	-
Score	[Note: Provide response/s if score is below 6]				
6	-				
Is the manuscript written in a scholarly manner?	8 -				
Does the manuscript have the potential to make a valuable contribution to the world of knowledge?	8 -				
Does the manuscript meet ethical standards?	7 -				
1. Major points: Author didn't mention the hearing threshold level of all the participants of this study. The hearing level of all the participants should measure by Pure Tone Audiometry, Impedance Audiometry and SRT before including the study. If different participants have different hearing threshold, then sensitive to noise may differ from one another.	A significant amount of research has been conducted in Bangladesh on sound level measurement, but there has been no research on the psychological effects of noise. Our focus is to examine the psychological impacts of noise rather than just the sound level. We conducted this study to address this gap in research.				
Reviewer's Recommendation: <b>Revisions required</b>					
Executive editor's name: <b>M Mostafa Zaman</b>					
ORCID: <b>0000-0002-1736-1342</b>					
1. Word counts: Reduce the Abstract to 200 and the main text to 1500 word.	Reduced the word counts, now abstract is 186 and main text is 1480.				
2. Reduce the number of highlight bullets to 3.	Number of highlights is reduced to 3.				
3. How did you determine social class? How valid was that approach? Drop it if you have not done it objectively. What is the relationship of marital status with this kind of study? Was it necessary?	Dropped both social class and marital status				

REVIEW COMMENTS	AUTHOR RESPONSE [Note: Please write the responses to each point here mentioning line number(s). You must change the manuscript as per your response.]
5. a. Statistical analysis should be detailed in the Methods section (see our articles online for example), NOT in the Results section. b. Two groups should be compared using <i>t</i> test, but three groups should be compared using ANOVA. Using multiple <i>t</i> test for comparing three groups is not correct.	a. Statistical analysis has been adjusted in the methods section. b. ANOVA is added (Table 4).
6. Drop <i>t</i> values from the results description, and the Discussion.	<i>t</i> values have been dropped.
7. Table 2: Write results in one column as Mean (SD) as per our style.	Changes in Table 3 (due to the mean and SD values being in Table 3, not Table 2)
8. Table 3: Three groups must be compared using ANOVA for quantitative variables. Chi-square for the categorical variables.	ANOVA has been used in the mentioned table.
Executive editor's decision: <b>Revision required</b>	
<b>ROUND 2</b>	
Executive editor's name: <b>M Mostafa Zaman</b>	
ORCID: <b>0000-0002-1736-1342</b>	
Comments sent to author (Date: <b>7-Jul-24</b> )	Date: <b>7-Jul-24</b>
1. Statistical analysis: You have to justify the choice of tests used: <i>t</i> -test and chi-square test. Now, you do not have more than two categories for any variables. Therefore, ANOVA is no longer required. You have compared the scores using <i>t</i> test between groups. However, all the comparisons are univariate. Because your dependent variable is quantitative (and probably there is no major deviation from normality), you should use linear regression, entering all independent variables simultaneously to obtain adjusted beta estimates, their corresponding standard errors and P values. Present these results in a separate table. Please describe all these in the analysis section.	Used linear regression. Presented in a separate table (Table 4). Described in the analysis section.
2. Recommendations should not appear before the Conclusion. One or two-sentence recommendations can be part of the Conclusion.	Added recommendations in the conclusion part.
3. Avoid acronyms such as IAMEBBC. these are used only once. Provide full names.	Acronyms has been avoided.
4. Table 2: a. The independent and dependent variables have the same attribute of sensitivity scores. This is not a valid analysis.	Table 2: Categorizes the dependent variable, noise sensitivity, into low, medium, and high sensitivity based on the distribution of scores using quartiles (25th percentile, median, and 75th percentile). This table aims to provide a descriptive overview of how participants' scores are distributed, showing that 22.62% have low sensitivity, 58.14% have medium sensitivity, and 19.24% have high sensitivity. It is not intended for inferential statistical analysis, but rather to illustrate the

REVIEW COMMENTS	AUTHOR RESPONSE [Note: Please write the responses to each point here mentioning line number(s). You must change the manuscript as per your response.]
<p>b. What is the basis for low, middle, and high sensitivity? Is there any agreed threshold above which people are considered noise-sensitive?</p>	<p>prevalence of different sensitivity levels within the study population.</p> <p>We classified noise sensitivity based on percentiles (quartiles). In psychological scales where the total score is not pre-categorized (e.g., in DASS-21, the categories are normal, mild, moderate, severe, and extremely severe), a commonly accepted method of classification is using percentiles or quartiles.</p>
<p>5. Table 4 (ANOVA) is meaningless now. drop it. Replace it with linear regression.</p>	<p>Dropped and replaced with linear regression.</p>
<p>6. The scale (WNSS-SF-BV) you used is an unpublished tool you developed. You should have described it in the Methods section.</p>	<p>Updated and described in the method section (See measurement tools).</p>
<p>Executive editor's decision: <b>Revision required</b></p>	
<p><b>ROUND 3</b></p>	
<p>Executive editor's name: <b>M Mostafa Zaman</b></p>	
<p>ORCID: <b>0000-0002-1736-1342</b></p>	
<p>Comments sent to author (Date: <b>8-Jul-24</b>)</p>	<p>Date: <b>9-Jul-24</b></p>
<p>1. The statistical analysis section is grossly inadequate. Please add your choice and application for using t test. Describe your linear regression model. Mention whether it was a univariate or multivariate analysis. Remove the description of Table 1 from this subsection.</p>	<p>Choice and application for using t test is described. Linear regression model is mentioned (It is multivariate analysis). Removed the description of table 1.</p>
<p>2. Table 2: The responses are not convincing. The results given in three columns come from the same variable. If you want to describe the score values, present them in Table 1. If your argument is in favour of the quartiles, use four categories. For three categories, it should be tertiles. In the second column (to match the Table 1 format), provide the number (%).</p>	<p>Dropped table 2 and adjusted table number both text and table serial</p>
<p>3. Table 3: Drop <i>t</i> values. provide all results up to one decimal point, but the P values up to two decimal points.</p>	<p>Dropped <i>t</i> values. Also, provided all results in one decimal and P values up to two decimals.</p>
<p>4. Table 4: Drop <i>t</i> values. I am confused with your B and <math>\beta</math> values. The model should provide one beta value for each independent variable. Which is that beta? Remove the other one. Keep all results up to two decimal points.</p>	<p>Dropped <i>t</i> values. B means unstandardized coefficient and <math>\beta</math> means standardized coefficient. I dropped unstandardized coefficients (B) and Sta. error (SE) Column. The remaining standardized coefficient (<math>\beta</math>) is the beta that you are looking for. Provided all results in one decimal.</p>
<p>Executive editor's decision: <b>Revision required</b></p>	

**ROUND 4**

Executive editor's name: **M Mostafa Zaman**

ORCID: **0000-0002-1736-1342**

Comments sent to author (Date: **9-Jul-24**)

Date: **9-Jul-24**

1. Table 3: Please insert a column for SE of beta. Provide the exact *P* value for the last variable (Annoyance with noise) of Table 3. We do not use *P* values <0.01. Our style is to use <0.001 if the *P* value is very small. Otherwise, we report the exact *p* values.

Table 3, I have added a column for the beta standard error. Since the calculated *p*-value is exactly.000, I denoted it as *P*<.001 for noise annoyance and the F-test (the F-test *P*-value is located below the table). In other cases, I used the exact *P*-value with two decimals, as per your instructions.

**C. Editorial decision**

Final editorial decision: **Accepted on 10-Jul-24**