



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
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	Research paper

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	None The manuscript reported plagiarism of less than 15% which is less than 30% as required.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Created by: EA	14.7% PlagScan Results of plagiarism analysis from 2017-06-02 10:23 PM view: * All sources 11 20 matches All sources 11 Top three 3 Internet sources 11 [0] www.eajournals.org/wp-content/uploads/Es...ential-Buildings.pdf 6.4% 9 matches Highlight matches in source [1] https://www.researchgate.net/profile/D_R...gin=publication_list 1.6% 1 matches Highlight matches in source [2] www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JEES/article/download/22336/23452 1.5% 3 matches Highlight matches in source [3] https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Kha...gin=publication_list 1.4% 2 matches Highlight matches in source [4] https://www.scribd.com/document/65668952/92620090407 1.3% 1 matches Highlight matches in source [5] link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/s10967-014-2928-1.pdf 0.9% 1 matches Highlight matches in source [6] pubs.sciepub.com/ijp/3/6/4/index.html 0.9% 2 matches Highlight matches in source 1 documents with identical matches [8] https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Khalil_Ahmad7 0.7% 1 matches Highlight matches in source [9] jmpb.org/index.php/jmpb/article/viewFile/17/pdf_8 0.8% 1 matches Highlight matches in source [10] https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40710-016-0173-z 0.5% 1 matches Highlight matches in source [11] www.art.sfasu.edu/ceramics 0.4% 1 matches Highlight matches in source	Thus passed the test.
-----------------------	--	------------------------------



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Line 28: in other to ► in order to Line 36 of injuries ► of injuries Line 38 practicessuchas ► practices such as Line 39 30% to 50% ► 30-50% Line 58 avoid using <u>carried out</u> twice use others e.g conducted etc Line 75 conjunction and is lacking between facility, the ► facility and the.....include Notice at the end of Line 75 s is omitted. Line 78-80: To avoid repition better use following equipment: X-ray machine, Computerized Tomography (CT), Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) , Scanning and mammogram machine. Line 81: omit is between hospitals -----located Line 82: Better say-It is the 375 bed..... Line 102: Should read ...where readings.... Line 105: Should be: Six readings were taken in triplicate whereby average value for each was recorded. Line 124: meanindoor► mean indoor Line 126: write: respectively at the end Line 133/134: omit for the hospitals Line 187: Table 1 and 2 space between 2---the Line 102: space the outdoor Line 225: are0.60 ► are 0.60	
Optional/General comments	Based on objective evidence from results obtained the author has to stick much to the aim of the research work in concluding it all e.g Did the findings satisfy the objective of the research work? i.e This work was carried out to determine the radiation risk from background ionizing radiation exposures of selected hospitals in South-South, Nigeria. As such some of the lines have to be under discussion e.g concluding lines 2 and 3 are not necessary as that information is already in line 4 since the effective doses were calculated based on indoor and outdoor absorbed doses. Concluding line 1 should also be under discussion.. Therefore 222 -236 should be maintained.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wiseman Bekelesi
Department, University & Country	Chemistry, Hiroshima University, Japan