



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMMR_34239
Title of the Manuscript:	RADIATION RISK ASSESSMENT FROM BACKGROUND RADIATION EXPOSURES IN SELECTED HOSPITALS IN SOUTH – SOUTH NIGERIA
Type of the 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<u>Comments:</u> 1. There are a lot of typographical errors. The author(s) should edit the manuscript appropriately. 2. The literature review is very poor. There are several recent studies on radiation emissions which the author(s) should consult (such as Okoro et al., 2015: Characterization of Radiation Exposure Dose Rate from Waste Dumpsites within Owerri, Nigeria: An Atmospheric Concern. British Journal of Applied Science and Technology, 11(3) 1-9). 3. The general objective of this paper lacks merit and focus whereas the specific objectives were not adequately presented. 4. The Study area and Data acquisition sections were poorly presented. The sentence on line 69 contradicts the title of the paper and a map showing the locations will be appropriate. Reasons such as why the choice of hospitals was made or selected, what percentage of hospitals in the region does these hospitals represent, what is the spatial distribution of the hospitals within the region of study, do the	Thanks for your corrections. Though there is some aspect which we did not accept. This work was carried out to determine the radiation risk from background ionizing radiation exposures of selected hospitals in South-South, Nigeria. The manuscript has nothing to do with radiation emission from waste dump but rather the background radiation level of the selected hospitals in order to determine health risk due to exposure to background radiation. The issue of units used. Each radiological parameter has its own unit and was used correctly in this work.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	hospitals have adequate waste management facilities, is there any regulation on waste management within the region and what is the accuracy of the measuring equipment? Also, there was no description of the indoor and outdoor measurements. 5. The author(s) should be consistent in their choice of the unit as there are so many units to report radiation. This starts from the Abstract to the Conclusions. Also, the unit should be placed after the figures as highlighted in the text. 6. The paper should be adequately sectioned for clarity. Sections 4.1 and 4.2 would have been better presented under methodology. 7. The Tables are poorly presented and it is somewhat difficult to understand the communications from them. How long were the readings carried out at the numerous locations? If once, then the average for the locations should be reported. This is so as there could be so many errors emanating from events of the day, interference while measuring and meteorological variables. 8. Figures 1 to 6 are somewhat unnecessary if you address item 7 above. A better presentation of results can ensue. 9. In line 63, the author(s) talked about correlation but that is not seen anywhere in the paper.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	10. The methodology is so weak hence there is little or nothing one can deduct from the study. It is very difficult to point out what this study drives to achieve as knowing the radiation levels are not enough. 11. Further comments are highlighted and marked in the attached manuscript. 12. The English structure and grammar need adequate improvements.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The comments are on the highlighted/marked sections of the attached pdf manuscript.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		