



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_33104
Title of the Manuscript:	Risks Associated with Radio-frequency Radiation Exposure at Close Proximity to Mobile Phone Base Stations in Port Harcourt, Rivers State, 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Abstract Line 14: International Commission on non-Ionizing Radiation is an organization and thus does not set standard but "recommend permissible limit" please correct. Introduction -Lines 26-28 should be deleted. GSM mast has never made life easy but aid communication -Author should review literatures on Nigerian Communication Commission (NCC) minimum distance from residential building for installation of Mast and SAR limit adopted by NCC. -line 46: as shown... should be "has shown" Line 48: Author should separate literature for and against health detriment due living very closed to GSM base station and possible draw inference from them or justify the purpose for the study on that. 1.2 Study Area, should be under <i>Material and Method</i> - line 86: --- can be measured should read " can be detected and measured" - line 95; W_{hw} = human weight, should be "W_{hw} = Average human weight" Results and Discussion Table I: column four (4) on FCC should be detected from the table for uniformity and place on the roll under "400" but note that FCC has recommended permissible limit not Standard. Figures 1-4, may not be necessary as the SAR level in figures 5- 8 discuss clearly the Specific Absorption Rate (SAR) that impact the human health -Line 162: theoretical should be change to "previous" -Line 171: ... with the result, should be change to " in figures 1-4 if figure 5-8 is changed to 1-4 after deleting	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	the first four as suggested. Conclusion: The radiation density obtained varied sinusoidally with distance is not TRUE as the graphs obtained in the figures shown are not sinusoidal wave. Thus the opening remark in the conclusion should be recast. Recommendation one, has no scientific backing and has no correlation with the result the author presented and reported non negative health effects on human. Recommendation four, should be modified to conform to your report.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The author should go through the work and if possible consult an expert in English language for thorough proof reading of the work to correct some of the grammatical errors that are abound in the work. Author should also ensure all cited references are listed in the reference list.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	it added value to the ever growing concern for radiation health implications arising from non-ionizing radiation from GSM and GSM mast installed around residential areas cross the country	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Ezekiel O. Agbalagba</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Physics, Federal University Of Petroleum Resources, Nigeria</i>