



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Review in Physics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJR2P_45083
Title of the Manuscript:	Radioactivity Concentrations in Soil Samples from some Mines in Wurno LGA, Sokoto state, 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>)

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	1. The article topic should read RADIOACTIVITY CONCENTRATION IN SOIL SAMPLES FROM (..... mentioned the Place where Minning Site is situated ie town where samples was taken.) MINING SITE IN WURNO LGA, SOKOTO STATE NIGERIA. 2. From ABSTRACT : THE AIM should be corrected by replacing the word Enhance with NORMS (ie Naturally occurring radionuclide materials) it should read The study was conducted in a bid to ascertain the concentration of NORMS in the soil samples dugout of some Minning sites in..... town in WURNO LGA, SOKOTO STATE NIGERIA. The concerns about NORM radioactivity in the environment are frequently linked to 3. The map of the Minning sites, should be provided showing the Latitude and longitude of the mining sites, if possible pictures showing places where soil samples was collected.	Thank you for the critical observations as I have adequately responded to the comments. I am also pleading to you particularly for I was unable to incorporate the map of the study areas to include the sample points in the report.
Minor REVISION comments	1. The tables and figures should be included in the results and discussion sections, showing the following :- - Tables and figures for ABSORBED DOSE RATE for all the samples collected. - Tables and figures for ANNUAL EFFECTIVE DOSE RATE for all the samples collected. - Tables and figures for EXTERNAL HAZARD INDEX for all the samples collected. - Tables and figures for INTERNAL HAZARD INDEX for all the samples collected. - Tables and figures for EXCESS ALPHA RADIATION for all the samples collected. 2. All this tables and figures would help reader to understand the article better and whether it agree with recommended dose limit exposure to natural Radiation sources. This would also help to explained and interpret what is shown in his figure 1.	Thank you for your painstaking efforts of observing numerous points, but the tables and figures in my paper are under results and discussion section as observed in the comments. Also, alpha radiations are not of radiological concerns in the environmental except for fear of ingestion that cause imminent dangers to biological systems (cell, organ and tissue). There are as well external and internal indices of the samples on the tables presented under the result and discussion and also dose rates calculated from the activity concentrations of the NORMS. They are all illustrated on the chart of Figure under the results and discussion section. Thank you as I look forwards to prompt publication of my article.
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is scientifically robust and there is no ethnical issues in the manuscript.	Thank you for your careful scrutiny of this paper to ascertain its scientific strength.

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)	