



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_33104
Title of the Manuscript:	Risks Associated with Radio-frequency Radiation Exposure at Close Proximities 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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	(1)The authors should provide the specification of the power meter (manufacturer, sensitivity etc.), because it is vital to evaluate the validity of the measurement, but I could not find the manufacturer on the web. What are the upper and the lower limit of the frequency (line 86-87,page 3)? (2)The measured power is not a simple decaying character. Is this common to the power associated with the radiofrequency radiation? A recent report (Waldmann-Selsam et al., 2016) has suggested that the electromagnetic radiation from base station can be weakened by nearby tree or buildings. Thus, more detailed arrangement of the structures such as buildings, and trees should be given and discussed in conjunction with the result. Authors mention the involvement of other networks, but before discussing those disturbances, they should discuss whether or not other buildings or trees affected the result. (3)How many independent measurements were performed to obtain each point in the graph? The reason I ask this is because each curve in the graph exhibits rather complicated behaviour, and the multiple measurement may reduce or eliminate such fluctuations. (4)The authors conclude that the electromagnetic field emitted from the base station is safe, because the power is below the safety standards set by the government. However, being below the safety standard does not guarantee that the exposure to suchfield is safe, because a number of previous	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	studies have indicated that many adverse effects of the weak electromagnetic fields at the intensities well below the safety guideline set by, for example, ICNIRP. This point should be discussed. (5)Is the reference “EM watch” adequate? I think there is more suitable source of information on this matter.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	(1)Number of the masts in each station does not seem to be cited in the text; page 10, line 159 states an important observation. This observation should be represented with a graph. (2)Cite the reference that supports the statement in line 170, in page 10. (3)I believe that readers need more detailed map of the studied area.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	(1)English should be polished up. (2)I think some discussions based on ambiguous assumption should be removed or rewritten.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Hidetake Miyata</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Physics, Tohoku University, Japan</i>