



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The article is a novel and can be potentially interesting to the reader in a practical way, however this paper needs appropriate more scientific discussion of the results.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Title The title name is <i>NATURAL RADIOACTIVITY AND RADIOLOGICAL RISK ESTIMATION OF DRINKING WATER FROM OKPOSI AND UBURU SALT LAKE AREA, EBONYI STATE, NIGERIA</i>, however in this article you talk about various water. Please clarify what is various water.</p> <p>Abstract The abstract reflects the content of the article.</p> <p>Introduction Here you need to talk about artificial radionuclides (40K, 232Th, 238U) you choose to analyze in the article not about Rn. You need to write equations you use in the text. I could not find the calculation in article you did with equation 1.</p> <p>Graphical abstracts and/or highlights No highlights have been provided. The Graphical abstract is okay, but in the 3rd Fig and all equations you need to write measurements units. The author should number equations.</p> <p>Description of the Study Area It would be helpful if the author wrote the technical information about</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>boreholes (number of wells, depth hydrogeological characteristic, water level). How many samples did you take? The graphic material would be very helpful.</p> <p>Experimental Setup Could you please explain how was estimated measurement errors.</p> <p>Results and discussion The results are clearly presented. Though the authors merged results and discussion parts into one chapter, however no appropriate discussion of the results have been done. Clarify if results from Table 5: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS yours or other authors. The authors have only presented results in ground water from the study area however no qualitative interpretation of the results has been done.</p> <p>Some suggestions for the discussion: What do these results mean for the human health, ecosystem surrounding the study area. How does it look like compared to the other territories of the similar places around the world. What suggestion author could say taking in order to decrease or avoid pollution in the groundwater.</p> <p>Conclusion/Discussion Conclusions are only the repetition of the results and no clear concluding remarks are presented. No recommendations. Conclusions do not explain how the research has moved the body of scientific knowledge forward.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The article is acceptable.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Vigilija Cidzikiene</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Vilnius Gedimino technical university, Lithuania</i>