



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Review in Physics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJR2P_41506
Title of the Manuscript:	Measurement of Natural Radionuclides (40K, 238U and 232Th) and Associated Dose Rates in Soil and Commonly Consumed Foods (Vegetables and Tubers) at Okitipupa, Ondo State, Southwestern 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 presents some interesting results but it needs to review diverse points. I consider that the proposed changes are minor since the authors could implement them without further experimental work but they must be implemented. The main criticism is that the authors should present a more extensive and intense discussion of their results. A paper is different from a technical report in that it attempts to build knowledge. The authors need to advance explanations for their results based on the state of the knowledge and, eventually, presenting their own novel hypothesis. This concerns not only the differences between the organic entities (why are concentrations higher in the water leaf samples than that in the bitter leaf samples?; Why are concentrations in the yam samples higher than those in the cassava samples? Why are concentrations so much higher in the leaf than in yam and cassava?) as well as elements (Fig. 1 shows a marked difference between U+Th in relation to K, especially in the leaf; the differences are lower in the cassava and yam samples). And these results should be compared with the state of the knowledge in terms of transfer of this radioactive elements to organic entities (namely the species being considered). I think that the authors should replace Fig. 1 with a boxplot (a possible freeware to do that kind of plot is PAST-https://folk.uio.no/ohammer/past/ but there must be many others available online). It will be also interesting to present an assessment of the potential impact for organic beings (namely humans) of the radioisotopes levels that are present in the organic entities (leafs, etc.). In relation to soil there are recommendations in relation to the annual dose but what about this organic objects? Since the author's do not present an extensive discussion, it is not easy to see why did they estimated the outdoor dose resulting from the soil. It is necessary to present a description of the soils as well as the general Geology of the studied area.	Thank you for the observations. 1. We have included reasons (highlighted) in the work on why concentrations in vegetables were higher than concentrations in tubers. 2. A marked difference has been included to the graphs by using a boxplot graph. 3. An assessment of the effect on human has been included. 4. Description of the geology of the study area have also been included.
Minor REVISION comments	There are other details. The language is suitable in general but perhaps it will be better to remove the first sentence of the abstract since is slightly odd-sounding and the paper is not exactly on NORMs as they are usually understood. Please check whether it is Talinium triangulae or Talinium triangulare. I think it will be better to express the annual dose estimations in mSv (is more usual and it will lead to more easy to read numbers) Replace Activity by Specific Activity where adequated Map 1 should have a graphic scale and the indication of the north direction and should be changed to Fig. 1 (and Figure 2 will become Figure 2). In section 2.6 it should be explicitly stated that the equation is for outdoor dose	1. Talinium triangulare is the correct spelling 2. specific activity is now used 3. map 1 has been changed to a more detailed one.
Optional/General comments		