



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_31625
Title of the Manuscript:	NATURAL RADIOACTIVITY AND RADIOLOGICAL RISK ESTIMATION OF DRINKING WATER FROM OKPOSI AND UBURU SALT LAKE AREA, 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 (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	<p>Abstract should be completely rewritten. In the literature there are many manuscripts on exactly the same topic, i.e. radiological characteristic of water (drinking, top, surface, waste, precipitation, groundwater...). That the manuscript to have the weight, it takes a lot more results than the concentrations of radionuclides and assessment of doses.</p> <p>In the abstract aim, experimental, place, results should not stand. If the authors mention the abbreviation, they must write what it means. BDL-below the limit of detection, or minimum detectable concentration-MDC.</p> <p>In introduction in the before last paragraph authors cite some references about investigation of water. It is just four, five references. Authors should cite a lot of more references.</p> <p>I say again the aim is not adequate. References 22-24 are missing in the text.</p> <p>Lines 120-131 are generally known and should be deleted together with table 1.</p> <p>Authors should choose between table 3 and figure 2, because they present the same results. One should be ejected.</p> <p>In the text under the results the authors only discuss the value they received. This discussion must be on a much higher level of write.</p>	<p>Thanks. Abstracts was written following the journals format. BDL full meaning was in foot note and not in the table as you suggested.</p> <p>Some literatures have been added to the work but don't expect all the literatures on radioactivity concentration on water to be in this work.</p> <p>All other correction has been made,</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	This kind of result are presented in many papers dealing with radioactivity of water samples.	