

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Physical and Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOPACS_92901
Title of the Manuscript:	Measurement of radioactivity concentration in Pegmatite Rocks samples and dose assessment from Wamba in North Central 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:

(<https://www.journalajopacs.com/index.php/AJOPACS/editorial-policy>)

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>1- there are many scientific problems , shown in Bold Green , should be revised:</p> <p>a- calibration energy of 1836 keV is not emitted from Co -60</p> <p>b- efficiency at 25 cm from detector , but the authors use well - type detector , explain how? and why?</p> <p>c- they use point sources for energy calibration , but their samples are not point sources, explain how ?</p> <p>d- there is a confusion in eqs.1 and 2 , and sentences following them , the ideas should be verified ? explain</p> <p>e- explain why the authors results are very high (more than one order of magnitude) compared to other studies given in table 5, ? are they sure of their results?</p> <p>f- dimensions of the NaI(Tl) detector may be given.</p> <p>2- English language corrections :shown in Red sentences should be given.</p> <p>3- Ref. no 37 is absent from the text.</p> <p>4- all equations should be given between parentheses .</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>1- the authors can use hyper pure germanium (HPGe)detectors because of their supreme energy resolution over the scintillation detectors , so that their results will be more accurate.</p> <p>2- All the above correction must be made before considering for publication.</p>	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohammed Eldaghmah
Department, University & Country	Naif Arab University for Security Sciences, Saudi Arabia