



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_35298
Title of the Manuscript:	Measurement and Evaluation of Health Effects due to Ionizing Radiation from High Tension Lines on around Kaduna Metropolis, North West, 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	The objective of this research is as follows: 63 Based on these guide lines, an attempt was made in this research, to measure ionizing radiation (gamma 64 rays) from high tension cables around houses, schools, work places that are close to the lines, around 65 Kaduna metropolis to determine emission levels of this radiation and the consequences on those living around the areas Unfortunately the objective of the study does not fit with the title: “Measurement and Evaluation of Health Effects due to Ionizing Radiation from High Tension Lines on around Kaduna Metropolis, North West, Nigeria.” There is no mention of how the evaluation of health effects would be carried out. Assuming that a high level would cause side effects is not enough to evaluate health effects. The conclusion shows that there is only measurement of ionizing radiation without evaluation of any health effects Comparison of the measured data for gamma radiation (ionizing radiation) showed that the highest 183 measured values from power lines and control site are about 46% and 52% respectively greater than 184 the ICRP data for the general public showing radiological hazard for the public even in the absence of 185 power lines. This major flaw has to be corrected. Authors please review if you really want to include health effects, as the references for this issue is also inadequate.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Adlina Suleiman
Department, University & Country	Faculty Of Medicine And Defence Health, National Defence University Of Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia