



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Review in Physics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJR2P_43997
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF NATURAL RADIOACTIVE DOSE LEVELS AND ASSOCIATED ANNUAL DOSE RATES OF HUMAN EXPOSURE TO CONTAMINANTS IN FOODS IN ABUJA, 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	- In the abstract it is necessary to make a small description of the places under study before giving the results. - The results in the abstract of the way they are indicated can not be understood. - Line 36. Change The levels at which naturally occurring radioactive elements by Naturally occurring radionuclides. - Line 74. Change figure. It isn't understood - In materials and methods does not describe the procedure for the measurements of the doses. - The results are presented in tables and graphs. Leave the results in one of the options. - Lines 184-188 The described results are not understood is necessary to organize them otherwise	
Minor REVISION comments	Line 12. Remove (8) Line 13. Remove forty-eight. Only 48 without parenthesis Line 67. Capital Territory, latitude, longitude. They have different lyrics Line 106. Remove forty-eight. Only 48 without parenthesis	
Optional/General comments		

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) There aren't ethical problems in the manuscript	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	María De Lourdes Villalba
Department, University & Country	Universidad Autónoma De Chihuahua, Mexico