



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Physical Science International Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_28074
Title of the Manuscript:	The Radiological Impact of a Municipal Solid Waste dumpsite on Soil and Groundwater using Gamma Ray Spectroscopy.
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 (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	1. Why 2 different groups of keywords. 2. Normally, the ground water has excess of radon than the ambient water. For this reason, it used to know the amount of submarine groundwater discharge. 3. Lines 42 and 43 have different latitude and longitude than the appeared in the map in Fig 1. 4. Line 92; Identify the standard sources used and its calibration results. 5. The abbreviation of kelo is k and not K; so change all KeV to keV. 6. Line 97; the system has to contain amplifier also. 7. The samples under investigation are very few (very limited number of samples). 8. In table 3; the errors is very high compared to the values but it means that the counting time is not correct and limited and has to increase. 9. Lines 174 and 175; they have to delete. 10. Line 177; change the title to Results and Discussion. 11. Results in Table 5 '6.85' is lower than the results of water in Table 6 mean '6.98' how? 12. Line 187; delete this title 13. Line 205; is Niger delta states is contaminated also!! 14. Lines 212 and 213; please check	It was an error Noted Noted Noted Noted ok More sample results have been added This was how the result was sent from the lab. Noted Noted It is lower because, Table 5 is the results from the lab while the value for table six is the average of ADR for water. From the results of previous research work Noted



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	1. Line 12; change has to have 2. Line 17; 235U is very small series in nature and always it no mention. 3. Line 20; country should be mention 4. Line27; change 'animals, humans are exposed' to 'animals. Human may exposed'. 5. Line 80; why short line sentence. 6. Line 88; what is 'lle lfe'. 7. Line 92; change 'was made possible' to 'were carried out'. 8. Lines 158 and 185; change 'water' to 'groundwater' 9. Line 189; change 'shows' to 'show' 10. Line 191; change 'non series' to 'single occurrence' 11. Line 203; delete 'of 40K' 12. Line 204' change 'of measured' to 'of previously measured' 13. Line 216; change 'and 2.13' to 'and range 2.13'	All the minor corrections has been taken care of.
Optional/General comments	1. It has present comma before respectively in all the text.	