



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_28111
Title of the Manuscript:	GROSS ALPHA AND BETA ACTIVITY CONCENTRATIONS IN LOCALLY PROCESSED SALT FROM EBONYI STATE, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original Research 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	<p>Equations are written as a picture, they are not displayed correctly.</p> <p>Figures 1 and 2 are unnecessary.</p> <p>In equation (1) authors wrote that 0.077 is the expected mass of the residue in the planchet. I do not agree, precise mass is required.</p> <p>Efficiency for alpha is 87.95 %??? It is quite large. I need explanation in detail how they determine efficiency for alpha.</p> <p>Figures 4, 5 and 6 do not see. What is x axis? Or secure new figures, or throw them out, thus can not remain.</p> <p>The first sentence in discussion: which confirm that the sources may possibly contain homogeneous alpha emitting natural radionuclides. For this conclude more analysis is required. Authors also wrote that there are more beta emitting radionuclides than alpha emitters. This is a serious conclusion. Also more analysis is required.</p> <p>Why the authors compare the fertilizer and soil. It has nothing to do with this work.</p> <p>At the end, what is most important, there are no values for salt which are permitted. Whether they are used for consumption. There must be allowed value in the some regulations.</p>	<p>We have used equation editor to re-write the equations.</p> <p>These are the detector efficiencies gotten from calibrations using the radionuclide sources mentioned in section 2.3</p> <p>We have removed these Figures and replaced them with geological maps.</p> <p>The Figures are now okay with the axis well labelled.</p> <p>We have harmonised this statements.</p> <p>We have compared the results with the standard activity limit set for general consumed foods</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		