



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_34239
Title of the Manuscript:	RADIATION RISK ASSESSMENT FROM BACKGROUND RADIATION EXPOSURES IN SELECTED HOSPITALS IN SOUTH – SOUTH NIGERIA
Type of the Article	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 1: Comments

	Editor's comment	Author's Feedback
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. This study did not give the main message to the reader; it is missing the clinical significance of radiation effect. "What is the impact of such differences in the measured values(indoor vs. outdoor) if the risk is not rated (high, moderate or low). (Should be in the discussion) 2. The authors did not mentionedfor how long (if applicable) thesedepartments of the above three hospitals (BMSH, UPTH and UUTH) have been exposed to radiations (how long radiation instruments have been used), so the early risk vs. late risk can be evaluated. (Should be in methods and material) 3. The authors stated in the last paragraph of the conclusion <i>"The results showed high levels of background radiation in the three hospitals studied, though it might not pose any immediate radiation related sickness to patients and staff of the hospitals, but long term exposure could pose some radiological risk". In this regard how did the authors reach this conclusion, is there any kind of documentation forthe follow up of the staff.</i> (Should be in introduction/ material) 4. The authors did not mentioned anything	The risk parameters rated relatively high. The absorbed dose and excess lifetime cancer risk ie the probability of exposed individual developing cancer was higher than the acceptable value. Therefore the background radiation of the hospitals were relatively high. The interest of the authors was not to evaluate early or late risk but on the estimation of the background ionizing radiation (indoor and outdoor) that will help in the ongoing study on occupational exposure of radiological workers of the three hospitals. The revised version of this work does not contain the stated comment. The hospitals studied had policies, standards radiological procedures and safety regulations but the implementation was the problem and has formed part of the recommendations made in the revised version.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	about the policy of the hospitals, standers of procedures for the related departments, safety regulations, maintenancerecordsand safety agencies that periodically inspect the facility. In order to support your conclusion; you should emphasis highly on these measure to be implemented. (Should be under recommendations)	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Some typographic present and these should not be a an issue, I believe it is from the software.	