SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJEE_38474**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Gross Effect of Beta Radioactivity Concentration in Groundwater at Kakuri, Kaduna South Local Government Kaduna, Nigeria**
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)

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 paper deals with a measurement of beta radioactivity of underground waters in selected area in Nigeria. The topic is very actual, the state-of-art is very well, the measurement methods used are appropriate. Authors present original experimental results. My comments to improve the manuscript: 1. I suggest checking English through the whole text, I found several mistakes, e.g. the aim of the paper is to analyse … not The aim of the paper is to analysis…; page 2: These radionuclides instead of these radionuclide; page 6: Figures 1-6 instead of Figure 1-6; page 4: When the sample is… please revise the whole paragraph, re-stylise these sentences. 2. Use pH instead of PH – page 4 and anywhere else. 3. The term Nitric acid is ok, commonly used than trioxonitrate acid. 4. There is no need to give the mass twice 0.077 g and 77 mg at the same place, please chose one expression, I propose the SI units. 5. The description of sampling in part 2. Material and Methods is the same as in part beta activity, please avoid a duplicity. 6. I suggest moving the specification of detector from the part results to the part 2. Material and Methods. All information regarding the materials, site, and analytical methods should be given in section Material and Methods. 7. Please avoid the duplicity in presenting the results: give results in tables or in figures, not both for the same sample. 8. Fig. 5 – use gig letter for volume Bq/L. 9. I cannot see the mean values in Figures 1 and 2 as reported by authors, please revise. The paper presents interesting results and I recommend the publication of the manuscript after major revision.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Adriana Estokova***
Department, University & Country	***Technical University of Kosice, Slovakia***