

## EVALUATION OF RADIOLOGICAL HAZARDS ASSOCIATED WITH SOME SELECTED MINING SITES IN NIGER STATE, NIGERIA

### ABSTRACT

Evaluation of Radiological Radionuclides Hazards associated with some selected mining sites (ieGadaeragi, Maiwayo and Kataeragi) in Niger State, Nigeria was carried out to determined usingNal (TI) Gamma ray spectroscopy, the results shows average activity concentration for  $U^{238}$ ,  $Th^{232}$ , and  $K^{40}$ , in Gadaeragi mining site are  $8.05 \pm 0.14$  Bq/kg,  $14.60 \pm 0.30$  Bq/kg and  $20.62 \pm 14.62$  Bq/kg respectively. the result shows average activity concentration for  $^{238}U$ ,  $^{232}Th$  and  $^{40}K$  in Maiwayo mining site and  $12.03 \pm 0.17$  Bq/kg,  $17.89 \pm 0.32$  Bq/kg and  $151.11 \pm 10.04$  Bq/kg respectively, furthermore, the results shows average activity concentration for  $^{238}U$ ,  $^{232}Th$  and  $^{40}K$  in Kataeragi mining site are  $6.39 \pm 0.13$  Bq/kg,  $13.25 \pm 0.29$  Bq/kg and  $154.87 \pm 10.77$  Bq/kg respectively, then, the mean average of the three mining sites average activities concentration for  $^{232}U$ , MW>GR>KR, For  $^{232}Th$ , MW>GR>KR and for  $^{40}K$ , GR>KR> MW respectively. The activity concentrations was found to be below worldwide accepted average values of  $45$  Bq/kg<sup>-1</sup>,  $33$  Bq/kg<sup>-1</sup> and  $420$  Bq/kg<sup>-1</sup> for  $^{232}Th$ ,  $^{238}U$  and  $^{40}K$  respectively. The Annual Effective Dose Equivalent of 0.16, 0.17 and 0.13 mSv/y estimated for GR, MW and KR respectively are below the 1.00 mSv/y threshold stipulated by UNSCEAR (2021). Therefore, the mining sites are safe in terms of radiological hazard. The entire environment is within the permissible dose limit for the workers of the mining sites and also for agriculture and construction buildings. Therefore, the mining sites are safe in terms of radiological hazard.

*Keywords:Radionuclide, soil, mining,activity concentration, absorbed dose, Niger State*

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Naturally occurring radionuclide materials (NORM) in soil samples produce external exposure to radiation and natural radioactivity in soil is caused principally by  $^{238}U$ ,  $^{235}U$ ,  $^{232}Th$ , and to a lesser extent by  $^{40}K$  and  $^{87}Rb$ . Radiation from these sources are generally of low doses but could pose health problems. In 1977, study by Advisory Committee on Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiation as well as the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation report of 1977 have all shown that even low doses of radiation pose a human cancer risk three to four times higher than previously estimated. The estimated cancer risks for children exposed are also about twice as large as those for adults.

Radionuclide in natural environment may be acquired into the body unintentionally

through inhalation, ingestion or absorption (IAEA, 1989). Subsequently, they are deposited at various sites in the body. The human body cannot sense exposure to radiation directly except at levels that are invariably lethal and therefore, it cannot provide defense against it. Because of the severity of this problem therefore, acceptable (safe) levels of radiation exposure and consequently radiation doses (maximum permissible doses - MPD) have been set by various bodies based on research findings in this field. These bodies include the National Academy of Science/National Research Council Advisory Committee on Biological Effect of Ionizing Radiation (BEIR), International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP), National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurement (NCRP), International Commission on Radiation Units and Measurements (ICRU), United Nations

**Comment [PA1]:** The manuscript is about evaluation of radiological hazards associated with some selected mining sites in Niger State, Nigeria. The authors have made a detailed description and research on the topic. However, there are still many obvious problems in this paper. The author(s) are suggested to carefully proofread the whole context and make the necessary corrections, as indicated, to improve the quality of the manuscript.

**Comment [PA3]:** Not in the list of reference

**Comment [PA2]:** Recast

Scientific Committee on Effect of Atomic Radiation (UNSCEAR), International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) as well as World Health Organization (WHO).

Maximum permissible dose (MPD) for non-occupationally exposed individual is put at 1mSv/yr(UNSCEAR). At higher doses, ionizing radiation is dangerous. It is therefore necessary to know the level of radiation within our living environment because of the health implications (UNSCEAR).

Radiation exposure carries a health risk, which help the regulatory bodies establish dose limit and regulations that keep the exposure at acceptable or tolerable risk level, where it is unlikely to cause harm. Nowadays, however, it is realized that a very large number of workers are exposed to natural sources of radiation, mainly in the mining industry. For certain occupations in the mining sector, inhaling radon gas dominates radiation exposure at work. While the release of radon in underground uranium mining makes a substantial contribution to occupational exposure on the part of the nuclear industry, the annual average effective dose for a worker in the nuclear industry overall has decreased from 4.4 mSv in the 1970s to about 1 mSv today (Killeen, 1979).

However, the annual average effective dose to a coal miner is still about 2.4 mSv and for other miners about 3 mSv. The current estimate of the total number of monitored workers is about 23 million worldwide, of whom about 10 million are exposed to artificial sources (Killeen, 1979). Three out of four workers exposed to artificial sources work in the medical sector, with an annual effective dose per worker of 0.5 mSv(Killeen, 1979). Evaluation of the trends of the average annual effective dose per worker shows an increase in exposure from natural sources mainly due to mining and a decrease in exposure from artificial

sources mainly because of the successful implementation of radiation protection measures (Killeen, 1979).

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

A frame work for the protection of environment against the hazards of radiation from the solid minerals processing requires a logical methodology for proper assessing. The dose ratio arising from the natural occurring radionuclide. The methodology that was employed in carrying out this research work includes careful collections of soil samples from mining sites, transportation of the sealed samples toLadokeAkintola University of Technology (LAUTECH), Ogbomosho, Physics department and then analysis of the samples which would generate result for interpretation.

Ten soil samples were each collected from three mining sites of Maiwayo, Gadaeregi and Kataeregi ( making a total of thirty (30) soil samples) all in Niger State, Nigeria. Figure 1 shows the map of the sampling points. The soil samples were collected at depths 6- 8. Each sample was placed in a labelled polythene bag sealed to avoid cross contamination of the samples during transportation to the LAUTECH University, Ogbomosho for laboratory analysis.

The soil samples were each oven dry at a temperature of 110<sup>0</sup>C to remove any moisture. The samples were then grinded into powder(using mortar and pestle) sieved (with a wire mesh with holes of thickness. 0.5mm) and homogenized (Mustapha, 1996). Each soil samples weighing 350g wereplaced in hermitically sealed plastic beaker, sealed to prevent the escape of <sup>222</sup>Ra and <sup>220</sup>Rn and kept for 30 days to attain

Comment [PA4]: Year??

Comment [PA6]: The sentence is not complete

Comment [PA7]: Please quantify

Comment [PA5]: Not on the list

Comment [PA8]: Reconcile wit the reference

secular equilibrium (Okeyode and Akanni, 2009).

The samples were each measured for 36000s (i.e. 10 hours), NaI(TL) Gamma spectroscope detector. Prior to sample measurement, the detector was energy calibrated using  $^{137}\text{Cs}$  (661.6 keV) and  $^{60}\text{Co}$  (1173.2 keV and 1332.4 keV). The detector efficiency was calibrated using a reference source consisting of radionuclides with known activity concentration:  $^{40}\text{K}$  (578.4 Bq/kg),  $^{238}\text{U}$  (20.9 Bq/kg) and  $^{232}\text{Th}$  (10.47 Bq/kg). The full energy peak efficiency ( $\epsilon$ ) was obtained using equation (1).

$$\epsilon = \frac{C_{net}}{A \times P_{\gamma} \times m \times T} \quad (1)$$

Where  $C_{net}$  is the net peak count for each radio nuclide present in the sample, after subtracting the back ground count from

gross count,  $P_{\gamma}$  is the absolute gamma ray emission probability of the identified radio nuclide,  $\epsilon$  is the obtained full energy peak efficiency for each identified radio nuclide,  $m$  is sample mass and  $T$  is the counting time. The radionuclides and gamma energy links used are given in Table 1.0.

An empty container with the sample geometry as that of the sample container was measured for 36000s (10 hours) to obtain the back ground contribution.

Using the full energy peak efficiency in equation (1), the activity concentration of the measured sample was obtained using equation (2).

$$A = \frac{C_{net}}{P_{\gamma} \times \epsilon \times m \times t} \quad (2)$$

Comment [PA11]: ???

Comment [PA9]: Not on the list

Comment [PA12]: ?

Comment [PA13]: T

Comment [PA14]: Table 1

Comment [PA10]: w




Figure 1: Map of Niger State showing study area




Figure 2: Map of the study area and points

**Table 1.0:** Detected Radio nuclide and the gamma energy lines used for determination of activity

Nuclide of Interest	Detected Isotope	Gamma ray energy Key
$^{226}\text{Ra}$	$^{214}\text{Bi}$	1764.0
$^{232}\text{Th}$	$^{208}\text{Tl}$	2614.5
$^{40}\text{K}$	$^{40}\text{K}$	1460.0

## 2.1 Calibration and Background Radiation

In order to use gamma spectrometer to identify samples of unknown composition, its energy scales were calibrated, the calibration was performed using peak of known source such as  $^{137}\text{Cs}$  and  $^{60}\text{Co}$ . These were along with the amplifier gain that gives 72% energy resolution for the 66.16 Kev of  $^{137}\text{Cs}$  and  $^{60}\text{Co}$  (1173.2 keV and 1332.4 keV). counted for 30 minutes.

The gamma spectrometer system employed consists of a 3'x3' NaI(Tl) detector, a product of Princeton Gamma Tech, USA. The detector is hold in a cylindrical lead shield to reduce the effect of background radiation.

## 2.2 Radiological Parameters

From the activity concentrations obtained using Equation 1, the following assessment criteria were used to quantify exposure to radiation in the artisanal gold mining area.

### 2.5.1 Radium Equivalent Activity ( $R_{eq}$ )

Radium Equivalent Activity ( $R_{eq}$ ) is the weighted sum of hazards associated with  $^{226}\text{Ra}$ ,  $^{232}\text{Th}$  and  $^{40}\text{K}$ . This index presumes that 1, 0.7 and 13 Bq/kg of  $^{226}\text{Ra}$ ,  $^{232}\text{Th}$  and  $^{40}\text{K}$ , respectively, produce equal terrestrial gamma dose rates (Beretka & Mathew, 1985); Gomina *et al.*, 2020; Kolo *et al.*, 2019; UNSCEAR, 2021). UNSCEAR (2021) stipulates a threshold of 370 Bq/kg for

Comment [PA15]: V

Comment [PA18]:  $R_{eq}$

Comment [PA16]: delete

Comment [PA17]: unclear sentence

Raeq (Suleiman *et al.*, 2018). Raeq was estimated using the equation (Gomina *et al.*, 2020; Kolo *et al.*, 2019; Osimobiet *al.*, 2018):

$$Ra_{eq} = A_{Ra} + 1.43A_{Th} + 0.077A_K \quad (3)$$

Where  $A_{Ra}$ ,  $A_{Th}$  and  $A_K$  are the specific activity concentrations of  $^{226}\text{Ra}$ ,  $^{232}\text{Th}$  and  $^{40}\text{K}$ , respectively, in the soil samples.

### 2.5.2 Gamma Radiation Dose ( $D_R$ )

The gamma radiation dose or absorbed dose ( $D_R$ ) at 1 m above the ground was estimated using the equation (Gomina *et al.*, 2020; Munyaradzi *et al.*, 2018; UNSCEAR, 2021):

$$D_R = 0.46A_{Ra} + 0.60A_{Th} + 0.0417A_K \quad (4)$$

Where  $D_R$  is the gamma radiation dose in nGy/h and the coefficients (0.462, 0.604 and 0.0417 in nGy/h per Bq/kg) are the dose conversion factors for  $^{226}\text{Ra}$ ,  $^{232}\text{Th}$  and  $^{40}\text{K}$ , respectively, as contained in the (UNSCEAR (2008) report.

### 2.5.3 Annual Effective Dose Equivalent (AEDE)

Annual Effective Dose Equivalent (AEDE) in mSv/y is estimated as the product of the gamma radiation dose,  $D$  (nGy/h), time in a year (8760 hours), dose conversion factor of 0.7 Sv/Gy and occupancy factor of 0.2 for outdoor exposure (Gomina *et al.*, 2020; Taskin *et al.*, 2009; UNSCEAR, 2021). AEDE was computed using the equation:

$$AEDE = D \times 8760 \times 0.7 \times 0.2 \times 10^{-6} \quad (5)$$

ICRP (2007) provided AEDE threshold of 1 mSv/y for public exposure.

### 2.5.4 Annual Gonadal Dose Equivalent (AGDE)

The annual gonadal dose equivalent (AGDE) is a measure of the dose received by the gonads (gamete producing organs) of exposed population in a year (Gomina *et al.*, 2020; Kolo *et al.*, 2015; Morsy *et al.*, 2012):

$$AGDE (\mu\text{Sv.y}^{-1}) = 3.09A_{Ra} + 4.18A_{Th} + 0.314A_K \quad (6)$$

Where  $A_{Ra}$ ,  $A_{Th}$  and  $A_K$  assume their respective definitions given before.

### 2.5.5 Activity Utilization Index (AUI)

Activity Utilization Index (AUI) is a parametric model used in determining NORM dose levels in the atmosphere from soil samples (Gomina *et al.*, 2020; Osimobiet *al.*, 2018). AUI was calculated from the specific activities of  $^{226}\text{Ra}$ ,  $^{232}\text{Th}$  and  $^{40}\text{K}$  in the sampled soils using the equation (Gomina *et al.*, 2020; Osimobiet *al.*, 2018; Sivakumaret *al.*, 2014):

$$AUI = \left( \frac{A_{Ra}}{50\text{Bq/kg}} \right) f_{Ra} + \left( \frac{A_{Th}}{50\text{Bq/kg}} \right) f_{Th} + \left( \frac{A_K}{50\text{Bq/kg}} \right) f_K \quad (7)$$

Where  $f_{Ra}$ ,  $f_{Th}$  and  $f_K$  having the numerical values of 0.462, 0.604 and 0.041, respectively, represent fragmentary supplements of  $^{226}\text{Ra}$ ,  $^{232}\text{Th}$  and  $^{40}\text{K}$  to the entire gamma dose (Chandrasekaran *et al.*, 2014; Gomina *et al.*, 2020).

### 2.5.6 External and Internal Hazard Indices

External hazard index ( $H_{ex}$ ) is a parameter used for evaluating external exposure to gamma radiation in air. The maximum allowed value for  $H_{ex}$  is 1, which corresponds to the upper limit of Raeq (370 Bq/kg) (Gomina *et al.*, 2020; Stranden, 1976; Suleiman *et al.*, 2018). Internal hazard index ( $H_{in}$ ), on the other hand, is a factor used to evaluate the hazardous effects of radon and its short lived progeny to the respiratory organs (Gomina *et al.*, 2020; Suleiman *et al.*, 2018). The threshold for  $H_{in}$  is also 1.

The external hazard index ( $H_{ex}$ ) and internal hazard index ( $H_{in}$ ) were estimated using the equations (Berehta and Mathew, 1985; Gomina *et al.*, 2020; Osimobiet *al.*, 2018):

$$H_{ex} = \frac{A_{Ra}}{370} + \frac{A_{Th}}{259} + \frac{A_K}{4810} \leq 1 \quad (8)$$

Comment [PA19]: w

Comment [PA23]: :

Comment [PA20]: w

Comment [PA21]: not on reference list

Comment [PA24]:  $H_{ex}$

Comment [PA22]: Tashin?

$$H_{in} = \frac{A_{Ra}}{185} + \frac{A_{Th}}{259} + \frac{A_K}{4810} \leq 1 \quad (9)$$

### 2.5.7 Representative Gamma Index ( $I_{\gamma r}$ )

Representative gamma index ( $I_{\gamma r}$ ) is used to evaluate the conformity of soil to dose standards set for building materials (Gominaet al., 2020; Jibiriet al., 2014; Koloet al., 2019). It categorizes materials that may induce radiological risk if deployed for construction (Gominaet al., 2020; Osimobiet al., 2018).  $I_{\gamma r}$  was computed from the equation (Gominaet al., 2020; Khater, et al., 2010; Osimobiet al., 2018)

$$I_{\gamma r} = \frac{A_{Ra}}{150} + \frac{A_{Th}}{100} + \frac{A_K}{1500} \quad (10)$$

$I_{\gamma r}$  must be  $\leq 1$  to satisfy the given dose criteria. This corresponds to an annual effective dose below 1 mSv (Gominaet al., 2020; Koloet al., 2019; Osimobiet al., 2018).

## 3. Results and Discussion

### 3.1. Activity concentration of NORM

Specific activities of primordial radionuclide in the samples collected from Gadaeregi (GR) mining site along with the location coordinates are shown in Table 1.1. The activities concentrations of  $^{238}\text{U}$  varied from  $5.94 \pm 0.12\text{Bq/kg}$  to  $9.19 \pm 0.15\text{Bq/kg}$  with an average value of  $8.05 \pm 0.14\text{ Bq/kg}$ . Specific activity values for  $^{232}\text{Th}$  ranged from  $11.42 \pm 0.27\text{Bq/kg}$  to  $16.98 \pm 0.32\text{Bq/kg}$ , with mean activity value of

### 2.5.8 Excess lifetime Cancer Risk (ELCR)

Excess Lifetime Cancer Risk (ELCR) is a measure of the probability that a certain stochastic effect will occur in an individual exposed to low doses of ionizing radiation over a given period of time (Gominaet al., 2020; Turyahabwaet al., 2016; UNSCEAR, 2021). The most common radiation induced health effects are incidence of cancers and genetic effects. ELCR was estimated using the equation (Munyaradziet al., 2018; Gominaet al., 2020; Taskinet al., 2009)

$$ELCR = AEDE \times DL \times RF \quad (11)$$

Where DL is the average duration of human life (estimated to be 70 years) and RF is risk factor (Sv-1) or fatal cancer risk per Sievert. For stochastic effects, which produce low background radiation, the ICRP 60 stipulates RF value of 0.05 for public exposure (Munyaradziet al., 2018; Gominaet al., 2020; Taskinet al., 2009).

$14.60 \pm 0.30\text{ Bq/kg}$ .  $^{40}\text{K}$  show much higher activity values than  $^{226}\text{Ra}$  and  $^{232}\text{Th}$  which of course should be expected owing to the natural abundance of  $^{40}\text{K}$  in the soil. Activity concentration of  $^{40}\text{K}$  varied from  $152.29 \pm 13.49\text{Bq/kg}$  to  $231.53 \pm 18.34\text{Bq/kg}$  (Table 1.1). The average activity value for  $^{40}\text{K}$  in the investigated mining site was lower than the world mean value of  $400\text{Bq/kg}$ .

**Table 1.1:** Activity concentrations of NORM in soil samples collected from GR mining site

Sample code	Activity concentration (Bq/kg)		
	$^{238}\text{U}$	$^{232}\text{Th}$	$^{40}\text{K}$
GR01	$9.19 \pm 0.15$	$14.88 \pm 0.30$	$224.17 \pm 16.79$
GR02	$9.11 \pm 0.15$	$14.80 \pm 0.30$	$231.53 \pm 18.34$
GR03	$9.15 \pm 0.15$	$16.73 \pm 0.32$	$218.29 \pm 15.63$
GR04	$6.87 \pm 0.13$	$16.98 \pm 0.32$	$210.24 \pm 17.05$
GR05	$8.14 \pm 0.15$	$14.16 \pm 0.30$	$208.20 \pm 15.92$

Comment [PA25]:  $I_{\gamma r}$

Comment [PA26]:

Comment [PA27]: Sv<sup>-1</sup>

GR06	9.14±0.15	14.66±0.30	211.50±11.91
GR07	8.73±0.15	14.28±0.30	224.31±15.40
GR08	5.94±0.12	13.92±0.29	197.44±10.18
GR09	8.11±0.15	14.12±0.30	188.19±11.48
GR10	6.11±0.13	11.42±0.27	152.29±13.49
Min	5.94±0.12	11.42±0.27	152.29±13.49
Max	9.19±0.15	16.98±0.32	231.53±18.34
Average	8.05±0.14	14.60±0.30	206.62±14.62

Specific activities of primordial radio nucleic in the sample collected from Maiwayo (MW) mining are shown in Table 1.2. Activity concentration of  $^{238}\text{U}$  varied from  $3.42 \pm 0.09\text{Bq/kg}$  to  $27.52 \pm 0.27\text{Bq/kg}$  with an average value of  $12.03 \pm 0.17\text{Bq/kg}$ . Specific activity values for  $^{232}\text{Th}$  ranged between  $7.04 \pm 0.21\text{Bq/kg}$  to  $35.47 \pm 0.27\text{Bq/kg}$ , with mean activity values of

$17.89 \pm 0.32\text{Bq/kg}$ .  $^{40}\text{K}$  show much higher activity values than  $^{226}\text{Ra}$  and  $^{232}\text{Th}$  which of course should be expected owing to the natural abundance of  $^{40}\text{K}$  in the soil. Activity concentration of  $^{40}\text{K}$  varied from  $72.54 \pm 5.95\text{Bq/kg}$  to  $251.32 \pm 10.53\text{Bq/kg}$  (Table 1.2). The average activity value for  $^{40}\text{K}$  in the investigated mining site was lower than the world mean value of  $400\text{Bq/kg}$ .

**Table 1.2:** Activity concentrations of NORM in soil samples collected from MW mining site

Sample code	Activity concentration (Bq/kg)		
	$^{238}\text{U}$	$^{232}\text{Th}$	$^{40}\text{K}$
MW11	5.14±0.12	11.19±0.26	151.01±11.91
MW12	7.57±0.14	12.89±0.28	126.13±9.22
MW13	8.46±0.15	11.31±0.27	124.25±7.46
MW14	7.49±0.14	12.39±0.28	122.83±6.03
MW15	7.90±0.14	11.84±0.27	139.42±14.31
MW16	26.78±0.26	34.30±0.46	214.09±15.97
MW17	22.27±0.26	35.47±0.47	228.43±12.11
MW18	27.52±0.27	34.54±0.46	251.32±10.53
MW19	3.42±0.09	7.90±0.22	81.03±6.87
MW20	3.70±0.10	7.04±0.21	72.54±5.95
Min	3.42±0.09	7.04±0.21	72.54±5.95
Max	27.52±0.27	35.47±0.47	251.32±10.53
Average	12.03±0.17	17.89±0.32	151.11±10.04

Specific activities of primordial radio nucleic in the soil sample collected from Kateregi (KR) mining site are shown in Table 1.3. Activity concentration of  $^{238}\text{U}$  varied from  $3.58 \pm 0.10\text{Bq/kg}$  to  $11.94$

$\pm 0.18\text{Bq/kg}$  with an average value of  $6.39 \pm 0.13\text{Bq/kg}$ . Specific activity values for  $^{232}\text{Th}$  ranged between  $7.80 \pm 0.22\text{Bq/kg}$  to  $18.27 \pm 0.34\text{Bq/kg}$ , with mean activity value of  $13.25 \pm 0.29\text{Bq/kg}$ .  $^{40}\text{K}$  show much higher

activity values than  $^{226}\text{Ra}$  and  $^{232}\text{Th}$  which of course should be expected owing to the natural abundance of  $^{40}\text{K}$  in the soil. Activity concentration of  $^{40}\text{K}$  varied from  $89.36 \pm 5.34\text{Bq/kg}$  to  $197.62 \pm 17.55\text{Bq/kg}$  with

mean value of  $154.87 \pm 10.77\text{Bq/kg}$  (Table 1.3). The average activity value for  $^{40}\text{K}$  in the investigated mining site was lower than the world mean value of  $400\text{Bq/kg}$ .

**Table 1.3:** Activity concentrations of NORM in soil samples collected from KR mining site

Sample code	Activity concentration (Bq/kg)		
	$^{238}\text{U}$	$^{232}\text{Th}$	$^{40}\text{K}$
KR21	$3.58 \pm 0.10$	$7.80 \pm 0.22$	$89.36 \pm 7.40$
KR22	$4.73 \pm 0.11$	$9.62 \pm 0.24$	$120.88 \pm 7.25$
KR23	$4.81 \pm 0.11$	$9.80 \pm 0.25$	$134.40 \pm 5.34$
KR24	$4.10 \pm 0.10$	$9.86 \pm 0.25$	$121.69 \pm 7.10$
KR25	$11.94 \pm 0.18$	$18.27 \pm 0.34$	$173.67 \pm 14.04$
KR26	$5.80 \pm 0.12$	$17.21 \pm 0.33$	$171.21 \pm 14.47$
KR27	$5.58 \pm 0.12$	$18.12 \pm 0.34$	$158.81 \pm 17.55$
KR28	$7.63 \pm 0.14$	$14.62 \pm 0.30$	$185.45 \pm 11.91$
KR29	$7.75 \pm 0.14$	$13.84 \pm 0.29$	$197.62 \pm 12.23$
KR30	$7.96 \pm 0.14$	$13.38 \pm 0.29$	$195.56 \pm 10.43$
Min	$3.58 \pm 0.10$	$7.80 \pm 0.22$	$89.36 \pm 5.34$
Max	$11.94 \pm 0.18$	$18.27 \pm 0.34$	$197.62 \pm 17.55$
Average	$6.39 \pm 0.13$	$13.25 \pm 0.29$	$154.87 \pm 10.77$

### 3.1.2 Radiological parameters

Computed  $Ra_{eq}$  radiological doses and other ratio hazard indices for Gadaeregi (GR) mining site are given in Table 1.4.  $Ra_{eq}$  varied from  $34.17 \pm 1.32\text{Bq/kg}^{-1}$  to  $49.88 \pm 1.81\text{Bq/kg}^{-1}$  with mean value of  $44.83 \pm 1.70\text{Bq/kg}^{-1}$ . This value was below the global upper limit of  $370\text{Bq/kg}^{-1}$  (Gominaet al., 2020; Koloet al., 2019; UNSCEAR, 2021). DR at 1m above the ground varied

from  $16.07\text{ nGy/h}$  to  $23.43\text{ nGy/h}$  with an average value of  $21.15\text{ nGy/h}$ . AEDE – Annual Effective. Dose equivalent has the ranged from  $0.12\text{mSv/y}$  to  $0.17\text{mSv/y}$  with mean value of  $0.16\text{mSv/y}$  AGDE ( $\mu\text{Sv.y}^{-1}$ ) Annual Gonadal Dose equivalent (Table 1.4), it has range from  $114.43\mu\text{Sv/y}$ , with mean average value of  $150.76\mu\text{Sv/y}$ .

Comment [PA28]:  $\mu\text{Sv.y}^{-1}$

**Table 1.4:** Radiological parameters for GR mining site

Sample code	$Ra_{eq}$ (Bq/kg)	D (nGy/h)	AEDE (mSv/y)	AGDE ( $\mu\text{Sv/y}$ )	AUI	$H_{ex}$	$H_{in}$	$I_{rr}$	ELCR ( $\times 10^{-3}$ )
GR01	$47.73 \pm 1.87$	22.58	0.17	160.98	0.93	0.13	0.15	0.36	0.58
GR02	$48.10 \pm 1.99$	22.80	0.17	162.71	0.94	0.13	0.15	0.36	0.59

GR03	49.88±1.81	23.43	0.17	166.75	0.95	0.13	0.16	0.37	0.60
GR04	47.34±1.90	22.20	0.16	158.22	0.90	0.13	0.15	0.36	0.57
GR05	44.42±1.80	21.00	0.15	149.72	0.86	0.12	0.14	0.33	0.54
GR06	46.39±1.50	21.90	0.16	155.93	0.90	0.13	0.15	0.35	0.56
GR07	46.42±1.76	22.01	0.16	157.10	0.91	0.13	0.15	0.35	0.57
GR08	41.05±1.32	19.39	0.14	138.54	0.79	0.11	0.13	0.31	0.50
GR09	42.79±1.46	20.12	0.15	143.17	0.82	0.12	0.14	0.32	0.52
GR10	34.17±1.55	16.07	0.12	114.43	0.66	0.09	0.11	0.26	0.41
Min	34.17±1.32	16.07	0.12	114.43	0.66	0.09	0.11	0.26	0.41
Max	49.88±1.81	23.43	0.17	166.75	0.95	0.13	0.16	0.37	0.60
Average	44.83±1.70	21.15	0.16	150.76	0.87	0.12	0.14	0.34	0.54

**Table 1.5:** Radiological parameters for MW mining site

Sample code	Ra <sub>eq</sub> (Bq/kg)	D (nGy/h)	AEDE (mSv/y)	AGDE (μSv/y)	AUI	H <sub>ex</sub>	H <sub>in</sub>	I <sub>yr</sub>	ELCR (10 <sup>-3</sup> )
MW11	32.77±1.41	15.43	0.11	110.07	0.63	0.09	0.10	0.25	0.40
MW12	35.71±1.25	16.54	0.12	116.88	0.66	0.10	0.12	0.26	0.43
MW13	34.20±1.11	15.92	0.12	112.43	0.64	0.09	0.12	0.25	0.41
MW14	34.67±1.00	16.07	0.12	113.50	0.64	0.09	0.11	0.26	0.41
MW15	35.57±1.63	16.61	0.12	117.68	0.67	0.10	0.12	0.26	0.43
MW16	92.31±2.15	42.02	0.31	293.35	1.65	0.25	0.32	0.66	1.08
MW17	90.58±1.86	41.24	0.30	288.81	1.61	0.24	0.30	0.66	1.06
MW18	96.26±1.74	44.06	0.32	308.33	1.74	0.26	0.33	0.70	1.13
MW19	20.96±0.93	9.73	0.07	69.03	0.39	0.06	0.07	0.16	0.25
MW20	19.35±0.86	8.99	0.07	63.64	0.36	0.05	0.06	0.14	0.23
Min	19.35±0.86	8.99	0.07	63.64	0.36	0.05	0.06	0.14	0.23
Max	96.26±2.15	44.06	0.32	308.33	1.74	0.26	0.33	0.70	1.13
Average	49.24±1.39	22.66	0.17	159.37	0.90	0.13	0.17	0.36	0.58

The computed Ra<sub>eq</sub> radiological doses and other ratio hazard indices are given in **Table 1.5**. Ra<sub>eq</sub> varied from 19.35 ± 0.86Bq/kg<sup>-1</sup> to 96.26 ± 2.15Bq/kg<sup>-1</sup> with mean value of 49.24 ± 1.39Bq/kg<sup>-1</sup>. This value was below the global upper limit of 370Bq/kg<sup>-1</sup> (Gominaet *al.*, 2020; Koloet *al.*, 2019; UNSCEAR, 2021). DR at 1m above the ground varied from 8.99 nGy/h to 44.06

nGy/h with an average value of 22.66 nGy/h. AEDE – Annual Effective Dose equivalent has the ranged from 0.07mSv/y to 0.32mSv/y with mean value of 0.17mSv/y. AGDE – Annual Gonadal Dose Equivalent (**Table 1.5**) it has ranged from 63.64uSv/y to 308.33uSv/y, with average value of 159.37uSv/y.

**Table 1.6:** Radiological parameters for KR mining site

Sample code	Ra <sub>eq</sub> (Bq/kg)	D (nGy/h)	AEDE (mSv/y)	AGDE (μSv/y)	AUI	H <sub>ex</sub>	H <sub>in</sub>	I <sub>yr</sub>	ELCR (×10 <sup>-3</sup> )
KR21	21.61±0.98	10.09	0.07	71.73	0.41	0.06	0.07	0.16	0.26
KR22	27.79±1.01	13.04	0.10	92.78	0.53	0.08	0.09	0.21	0.34
KR23	29.17±0.88	13.75	0.10	98.03	0.56	0.08	0.09	0.22	0.35
KR24	27.57±1.00	12.92	0.10	92.09	0.52	0.07	0.09	0.21	0.33
KR25	51.44±1.75	23.79	0.18	167.80	0.95	0.14	0.17	0.38	0.61
KR26	43.59±1.71	20.21	0.15	143.62	0.80	0.12	0.13	0.32	0.52
KR27	43.72±1.96	20.14	0.15	142.85	0.79	0.12	0.13	0.32	0.52
KR28	42.82±1.49	20.09	0.15	142.92	0.82	0.12	0.14	0.32	0.52
KR29	42.76±1.50	20.18	0.15	143.85	0.83	0.12	0.14	0.32	0.52
KR30	42.15±1.36	19.91	0.15	141.93	0.82	0.11	0.14	0.32	0.51
Min	21.61±0.88	10.09	0.07	71.73	0.41	0.06	0.07	0.16	0.26
Max	51.44±1.96	23.79	0.18	167.80	0.95	0.14	0.17	0.38	0.61
Average	37.26±1.36	17.41	0.13	123.76	0.70	0.10	0.12	0.28	0.45

Computed Ra<sub>eq</sub> radiological doses and radiation hazard indices for Kataregi mining site (KR) are given in Table 1.6, i.e. Ra<sub>eq</sub> varied from 21.61 ± 0.88Bq/kg<sup>-1</sup> to 51.44 ± 1.96Bq/kg<sup>-1</sup> with mean value of 37.26 ± 1.36Bq/kg<sup>-1</sup>. This value was below the global upper limit of 370Bq/kg<sup>-1</sup> (Gominaet al., 2020; Koloet al., 2019; UNSCEAR, 2021). DR at 1m above the ground varied from 10.09 nGy/h to 23.79 nGy/h with an average value of 17.41 nGy/h.

In table 1.4 (GR) mining site:-

The calculated AEDE values ranged between 0.12mSv/y to 0.17mSv/y, with mean value of 0.16mSv/y, which was lower than the 1mSv/y threshold recommended by ICRP (2007) for public exposure. AGDE recorded values ranging from 114.43 μSv/y to 166.7μSv/y, with mean value of 150.76 μSv/y.

Then, the values compacted for AUI ranged between 0.66 and 0.96, with a mean of 0.87. This satisfied the <2 threshold, corresponding to AEDE below 1mSv/y for radiological safety (Gominaet al., 2020; Osimobiet al., 2018; Sivakumaret al., 2014).

Computed values for external hazard index H<sub>ex</sub> and internal hazard index H<sub>in</sub> ranged from 0.09 to 0.13 and 0.11 to 0.16 respectively, with the average values of 0.12 and 0.14 in sequence. Furthermore, calculated values for I<sub>yr</sub> varied from 0.26 to 0.37, the computed mean I<sub>yr</sub> of 0.34, which must be ≤ 1 to satisfy the given dose criteria. This corresponds to annual effective dose below 1mSv (Gominaet al., 2020; Kodoet al., 2019; Osimobiet al., 2018). Similarly, the computed ELCR values for the Gadaeregi mining site varied from 0.41×10<sup>-3</sup> to 0.6×10<sup>-3</sup> with average value of 0.54×10<sup>-3</sup>. For table 1.5 (MW) mining site:-

The calculated AEDE values ranged between 0.07mSv/y to 0.32mSv/y, with mean value of 0.17mSv/y, which was lower than the 1mSv/y threshold recommended by ICRP (2007) for public exposure. AGDE recorded values ranging from 63.64μSv/y to 308.33μSv/y, with mean value of 159.37μSv/y (Chandrasekaran, et al., 2014).

Then, the values compacted for AUI ranged between 0.36 and 1.74, with a mean of 0.90. The satisfied the < 2 threshold, corresponding to AEDE below 1mSv/y for radiological safety (Gominaet al., 2020;

Comment [PA29]: ×

Osimobiet *al.*, 2018; Sivakumaret *al.*, 2014). Computed values for external hazard index **Hex** and internal hazard index **Hin** ranged from 0.05 to 0.26 and 0.06 to 0.33 respectively, with the average values of 0.13 and 0.17 in sequence.

Furthermore, calculated values for **I<sub>yr</sub>** varied from 0.14 to 0.70, the computed mean **I<sub>yr</sub>** of 0.36, which must be  $\leq 1$  to satisfy the given does criteria. This corresponds to annual effective dose below 1mSv (Kodoet *al.*, 2019; Osimobiet *al.*, 2018). Similarly, the computed ELCR values for the Maiwayu mining site varied from  $0.23 \times 10^{-3}$  to  $1.13 \times 10^{-3}$  with average value of  $0.58 \times 10^{-3}$ .

For table 1.6 (KR) mining site:-

The calculated AEDE values ranged between 0.07mSv/y to 0.18mSv/y, with mean value of 0.13mSv/y, which was lower than the 1mSv/y threshold recommended by ICRP (2007) for public exposure. AGDE recorded values ranging from 71.73uSv/y to 167.80uSv/y, with mean value of 123.76uSv/y.

### 3.2 Discussion of Results

Results presented in table 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 clearly showed spatial variation in activity concentrations which according to El-Mamney and Khater (2004) and Koloet *al.*, (2015), may be a result of geochemical and physiochemical characteristics of the radionuclide. However, despite the variations in the activity values, there appear to be an even distribution of primordial radionuclide across the mining site as depicted in the frequency distribution histograms as shown in figure 2.

Mean activity concentration of  $^{238}\text{U}$  was  $8.05 \pm 0.14\text{Bq/kg}$ , while  $^{232}\text{Th}$  recorded average specific activity of  $14.60 \pm 0.30\text{Bq/kg}$ . These values were found to be lower than their respective global average of 35Bq/kg and 30Bq/kg respectively as

Then, the values compacted for AUI ranged between 0.41 and 0.95, with a mean of 0.70. The satisfied the  $< 2$  threshold, corresponding to AEDE below 1mSv/y for radiological safety (Gominaet *al.*, 2020; Osimobiet *al.*, 2018; Sivakumaret *al.*, 2014).

Computed values for external hazard index **Hex** and internal hazard index **Hin** ranged from 0.06 to 0.14 and 0.07 to 0.17 respectively, with the average values of 0.10 and 0.12 in sequence.

Furthermore, calculated values for **I<sub>yr</sub>** varied from 0.16 to 0.38, the computed mean **I<sub>yr</sub>** of 0.28, which must be  $\leq 1$  to satisfy the given does criteria. This corresponds to annual effective dose below 1mSv (Gominaet *al.*, 2020; Kodoet *al.*, 2019; Osimobiet *al.*, 2018). Similarly, the computed ELCR values for the Kataeregi mining site varied from  $0.26 \times 10^{-3}$  to  $0.61 \times 10^{-3}$  with average value of  $0.45 \times 10^{-3}$ .

documented by UNSEAR (2021) for normal soils in (table 1.1) Gadaeregi mining site.

Then in Table 1.2, Maiwayu (MW) mining site, mean activity concentration of  $^{238}\text{U}$  was  $12.03 \pm 0.17\text{Bq/kg}$ , while  $^{232}\text{Th}$  recorded average specific activity of  $17.89 \pm 0.32\text{Bq/kg}$ . These values were found to be lower than their respective global average of 35Bq/kg and 30Bq/kg respectively as documented by UNSEAR (2021) for normal soils.

Furthermore, in the table 1.3, Kataeregi (KR) mining site, mean activity concentration of  $^{238}\text{U}$  was  $6.39 \pm 0.13\text{Bq/kg}$ , while  $^{232}\text{Th}$  recorded average specific activity of  $13.25 \pm 0.29\text{Bq/kg}$ . These values were found to be below their respective global average of 35Bq/kg and 30Bq/kg respectively as documented by UNSEAR

Comment [PA30]: ?

Comment [PA31]: ?

Comment [PA34]: Table

Comment [PA32]: Not on the list

Comment [PA33]: Figure

Comment [PA35]: T

(2021) for normal soils. This therefore, point to the likelihood of radioactive pollution Gadaeragi, Maiwayu and Kataeragi mining environment are within the permissible doses or global averages.

Gamma radiation dose  $D_R$  characterizing the studies soil samples from Gadaeragi, Maiwayu and Kataeragimining site. Average  $D_R$  at 1m above the ground was to be 21.15nGy/h, 22.66nGy/h and 17.41nGy/h. Although this value appear to be relatively below the global average of 57nGy/h documented by UNSCEAR (2021), its compares moderately with results of similar studies around the world (Doyiet *al.*,2013; Gominaet *al.*, 2020; Kamundaet *al.*,2016; Kuwanet *al.*,2009; Turyahabwaet *al.*,2016; Vinay Kumar Reddy *et al.*,2012).

Calculated Hex for the studies samples areas i.e. Gadaeragi, Maiwayo and Kataeragi varied between 0.09 to 0.13, 0.05 to 0.26 and 0.06 to 0.14, with a mean value of 0.12, 0.13 and 0.10. Although the average value was lower than the UNSCEAR (2021) established threshold of unity, the calculated mean Hin value of Gadaeragi, Maiwayu and Kataeragi are 0.14, 0.17 and 0.12 were below the UNSCEAR 2021 threshold of unity. The studies areas sample were within the permissible dose rate.

The variation in the representation of gamma index  $I_{\gamma r}$  obtained for the studies sample areas which represent about 100% of the studied samples recorded  $I_{\gamma r}$  value below the recommended UNSCEAR threshold.

Computed average for ELCR for the studied areas are  $0.54 \times 10^{-3}$ ,  $0.58 \times 10^{-3}$  and  $0.45 \times 10^{-3}$ , which are higher than the global mean of  $0.29 \times 10^{-3}$  (Gominaet *al.*, 2020; Munyaradzi et al., 2018; Taskinet *al.*, 2009).

#### 4.0 Summary

This works, the computed value of the average mean of annual effective dose

equivalent for the three mining sites (i.e. Gadaeragi, Maiwayo, and Kataeragi) are 0.16 mSv/y, 0.17mSv/y and 0.13mSv/y respective. Then the mean average of annual effective dose equivalent obtained from this site are below the world wide average, which tells us that the environment is safe for all activities.

#### 5.0 Conclusions.

Evaluation of human exposure to natural source of radiation on the soil samples of the three mining sites of Gadaeragi, Maiwayu and Kataeragi was determined using NaI (TI) Gamma ray spectroscopy, the results shows average activity concentration for  $U^{238}$ ,  $Th^{232}$ , and  $K^{40}$  in Gadaeragi mining site are  $8.05 \pm 0.14$  Bq/kg,  $14.60 \pm 0.30$  Bq/kg and  $20.62 \pm 14.62$  Bq/kg respectively. the result shows averages activity concentration for  $^{238}U$ ,  $^{232}Th$  and  $^{40}K$  in Maiwayo mining site and  $12.03 \pm 0.17$  Bq/kg,  $17.89 \pm 0.32$  Bq/kg and  $151.11 \pm 10.04$  Bq/kg respectively, furthermore, the shows average activity concentration for  $^{238}U$ ,  $^{232}Th$  and  $^{40}K$  in Kataeragi mining site are  $6.39 \pm 0.13$  Bq/kg,  $13.25 \pm 0.29$  Bq/kg and  $154.87 \pm 10.77$  Bq/kg respectively, then, the mean average of the three mining sites average activities concentration for  $^{232}U$ , MW>GR>KR, For  $^{232}Th$ , MW>GR>KR and For  $^{40}K$ , GR>KR>MW respectively. The activity concentrations was also found to below worldwide average values of  $45$  Bq/kg<sup>-1</sup>,  $33$  Bq/kg<sup>-1</sup> and  $420$  Bq/kg<sup>-1</sup> for  $^{232}Th$ ,  $^{238}U$  and  $^{40}K$  respectively. The entire environment is within the permissible dose limit for the workers of the mining sites and also for agriculture and construction buildings.

#### 6.0 Recommendation

The study was conducted using soils samples from the three mining sites of Gadaeragi, Maiwayo and Kataeragi in

Comment [PA36]: recast

Comment [PA40]: ???

Comment [PA37]: not on the list

Comment [PA38]: not on the list

Comment [PA39]: t

Katcha Local Government Area of Niger State, North Central, and Nigeria. More study needs to be carried out on these mining sites within the surrounding areas to find out the activity concentration of the radionuclide constitutes in the environment.

The three research mining sites of GR, MW and KR are all with average annual effective dose of 0.16mSv/y, 0.17mSv/y and 0.13mSv/y are below the safety limit of 1.0mSv/y as proposed by UNSCEAR, (2021).

## References

Beretka, J. and Mathew, P. (1985): Natural radio activity of Australian building materials, industrial wastes and by-products. *Health Phys.*, 48(1):87.

Benzi, F.P., Kifanga, L.D. and Bundala, F.M. (200) Natural radioactivity and radiation exposure at the Minijingu Phosphate mine in Tanzania, *J. Radiological Protection*, 20: 41-51.

Chandrasekaran, A.; Ravisankar, R.; Senthilkumar, P.; Venkatraman, B. (2014): Spatial distribution and lifetime cancer risk due to gamma radioactivity in Yelagiri Hills, Tamilnadu, India. *Egypt. J. Basic Appl. Sci.*, 1(1): 38.

Doyi, I.; Oppon, O.; Glover, E.; Gbeddy, G. and Kokroko, W. (2013): Assessment of occupational radiation exposure in underground artisanal gold mines in Togo, Upper East Region of Ghana. *J. Environ. Radioact.*, 126:77

Grupen, C. (1998). Physics of particle detection. Cambridge university press. 14-144.

Gilmore, G.R. (2008). *Practical Gamma-ray Spectrometry*, (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.) John Wiley, west Sussex, England.

Groot A. (2009). Salt-marsh sediment Natural  $\gamma$ -radioactivity and spatial patterns, PhD. (Mathematics and natural Sciences).Dissertation, University of Groningen.

Gomina, M.; Kolo, M. T. ;Awojoyobge, O. B. and Olarinoye, O. (2020). Artisanal Gold Mining Activity in Northcentral Nigeria and Its Implications: Radiological Approach. *Journal of Nuclear Technology in applied science*, 6, No. 1, PP. 15: 3

Hassan, N.M., Ishaikwa, T., Hosoda M., Iwaoka, K., Sorimachi, A., Sahoo, S.K., Janik, M., Kranrod, C., Yonehara, H., Fukushi, M. and Tokonami, S. (2010). The effect of water content on the radon emanation coefficient for some building materials used in Japan, *Radiation Measurement*.doi: 10.1016/j.radmeas.2010.11.006.

Hastings S., Doug R., Ensslin N. and Kreiner S. (1991). Passive Nondestructive assay of Nuclear Materials, LANL, Los Alamos, 27-63 pp.

Comment [PA41]: Arrange the references alphabetically

Comment [PA43]: Not cited

Comment [PA42]: Not cited

- IAEA (2004). International Atomic Energy Agency, Soil Sampling for environmental contaminants, IAEA-TECDOC-1415 IAEA: Vienna, Austria.
- ICRP (1991). ICRP publication 60 radiation protection: 1990 recommendation of the International Commission on Radiological Protection, Oxford: Pentagon press.
- ICRP. (2007): Recommendations of the International Commission on Radiological Protection ICRP. *ICRP Publication* 103: 37(2.4), 2.
- Jibiri, N.; Isinkaye, M. and Momoh, H. (2014): Assessment of radiation exposure levels at Alaba e-waste dumpsite in comparison with municipal waste dumpsites in southwest Nigeria. *J. Rad. Res. Appl. Sci.*, 7(4): 536.
- Jibrin and Okeyode I.C. (2012). Natural radio nuclides in the sediments of Ogun River in South Western Nigeria determined using Gamma-ray Spectrometry compared well with the values from other countries of normal radiation areas.
- Kamuda, C.; Mathuthu, M. and Madhuku, M. (2016): An assessment of radiological hazards from gold mine tailings in the province of Gauteng in South Africa. *Int. J. Env. Res. Pub. He.*, 13(1): 138.
- Khatar, A.E.; Al-Mobarak, L.; Aly, A.A. and Al-Omran, A. (2010): NORM in clay deposits. *Paper presented at the Proceedings of Third European IRPA Congress.*
- Kolo, M.; Baba-Kutigi, A. N; Olarinoye, I. and Sharifat, I. (2012): Assessment of natural radioactivity levels and radiation hazards in the tertiary institutions in Minna, Niger State, Nigeia. *Continental J. Environ. Sci.*, 6(3): 25.
- Kolo M.T.; Aziz, S.A.; Khandaker, M,U.; Asaduzaman, K. and Amin, Y.M. (2015): Evaluation of radiological risks due to natural radioactivity around Lynas Advanced Material Plant environment, Kuantan, Pahang, Malaysia. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res. Int.*, 22(17): 13127.
- Kolo. M.T.; Khandaker, M.U.; Amin, Y.M. and Abdullahi, W.H.B. (2016): Quantification and radiological risk estimation due to the presence of natural radionuclides in Maiganga Coal, Nigeria. *PloS One*, 11:6.
- Kolo, M.T; Khandaker; M.U. and Shuaibu, H.K. (2019): Natural radioactivity in soils around mega coal-fired cement factory in Nigeria and its implications on human health and environment. *Arab. J. Geosci.*, 12(15): 481.
- Kebwaro, M. (2009) Gamma ray spectrometric analysis of surface soils around Mrima Hill, Kenya, Using NaI(Tl) detector and decomposition technique. Msc thesis (Physics).Kenyatta University. Kenya.
- Kebwaro M., Rathore I., Hashim N. and Mustapha A.
- Comment [PA47]:** Not cited
- Comment [PA44]:** Not cited
- Comment [PA48]:** Not cited
- Comment [PA45]:** Not cited
- Comment [PA46]:** Reconcile with the citation

- (2011).Radiometric assessment of natural radioactivity levels around Mrima Hill, Kenya. *International Journal of Physical Science*.6(13): 3105 – 3110.
- Kessaratikoon P., Benjakul S. and Udomsompor S. (2007).Distribution of Natural Radio nuclides in Songkhla Beach Sands, *Kaset.Journal of Natural Science*.41: 157 – 164.
- L'annunziata, M.F. (2003). Handbook of radioactivity analysis, (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.)Elsevier Science, Oceanside, CA, U.S.A.
- Manigandan,P.K., Chandarsheker,B. (2004). Evaluation of radio nuclides in the terrestrial environment of Western Ghat. *Journal of Radiation Research and Applied Sciences*, 7(3):310-316.
- Mustapha A.O. (1999). Assessment of human exposure to natural sources of radiation in Kenya.Ph.D Thesis (Physics).University Of Nairobi. Kenya.
- Mustapha, A.O, Patel, J.P and Rathore, I.V.S. (1999). Assessment of Human exposure to natural sources of radiation in Kenya, *Radiation Production Dosimetry*82:272-285.
- Mustapha A.O, Mbuzukongira, P. and Mangara, M.J. (2007).Occupational radiation exposure of artisans mining columbite-tantalite in the Eastern Democratic Republic of Congo.*Journal of Radiological Protection* 27:187.
- Morsy, Z.; El-Wahab, M.A and El-Faramawy, N. (2012): Determination of natural radioactive elements in Abo Zaabal, Egypt by means of gamma spectroscopy. *Ann. Nuc. Energy*, 44:8.
- Munyaradzi, Z.; Anna, K.N. and Makondelele, T.V. (2018): Excess lifetime cancer risk due to natural radioactivity in soils: Case of Karibib town in Namibia. *African Rev. Phys.*, 13.
- Osimobi, J.; Avwiri, G. and Agbalagba, E. (2018): Radiometric and Radiogenic Heat Evaluation of Natural Radioactivity in Soil around Solid Minerals Mining Environment in South-Eastern Nigeria. *Environ. Proc.*, 5(4), 859.
- Odumo, O.b., Mustapha, A, O., Patel, J.P, Angeyo, H.K., (2011): Radiological survey and assessment of the naturally occurring radioactive materials (NORM) in the migoriartisanal gold mining belt of southern Nyanza, Kenya". *Applied Radiation and Isotopes*, 69,912-916.
- Podgorsak, E.B. (Ed.). (2005). *Radiation Oncology Physics: A handbook for Teachers and Students*. IAEA, Vienna.
- Ramasamy, V., Senthil S., Meenakshisundaram, v. and Gajendran, V. (2009). Measurement of natural radioactivity in beach sediments form north east coast of Tamilnadu, India, *Research and Applied*

Comment [PA49]: Not cited

	<i>Science Engineering Technology Journal</i> 1 (2): 54-58.		
Rittersdorf I.,	(2007). Gamma Ray Spectroscopy, Nuclear Engineering & Radiological Sciences [Online] Available: <a href="http://www-personal.umich.edu/~ianrit/gammasespec.pdf">http://www-personal.umich.edu/~ianrit/gammasespec.pdf</a> .	Turyahabwa, E.; Juruna, E.; Orianda, R.; Mugaiga, A. and Enjiku, B. (2016): Determination of natural radioactivity levels due to mine tailings from selected mines in southwestern Uganda. <i>Environ. Earth. Sci.</i> 6(6): 154.	
Sivakumar, S.; chandrasekaran, A.; Ravisankar, R.; Ravikumar, S.; Jebakumar, J.P.P.; Vijayagopal, P.; Jose, M. (2014): Measurement of natural radioactivity and evaluation of radiation hazards in coastal sediments of east coast of Tamilnadu using statistical approach. <i>J. Taibah Univ. Sci.</i> , 8(3): 375.		Tsoufanidis, N. (1995). Measurement and detection of radiation, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Ed. Taylor & Francis, London, 211-232 pp.	Comment [PA50]: Not cited
Stranden, E. (1976): Some aspect on radioactivity of building materials. <i>Phys. Norv.</i> , 8(3): 163.		Turhan, S., Bayakan, U. N., and Sen, K. (2008). Measurement of the natural radioactivity in building materials used in Ankara and assessment of external doses, <i>Journal for Radiological Protection Journal.</i> 28: 83 – 91.	Comment [PA53]: Not cited
Suleiman, K.; Agu, M. and Onimisi, M. (2018): Evaluation of Naturally Occurring Radionuclide in Soil Samples form Erena Mining Sites in Niger State, Nigeria. <i>Curr. J. Appl. Sci. Technol.</i> , 1.		UNSCEAR (2021). Report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation sixty-eighth sessions (21–25 June 2021) General Assembly, Official Records Seventy-sixth Session Supplement No. 46.	Comment [PA51]: Stranden.E (1976). Some aspects on radioactivity of building materials. Physical Norvegica. 8:167-177.
Stranden.E (1976).Some aspects on radioactivity of building materials.Physical Norvegica. 8:167-177.		UNSCEAR (2021). United Nations Scientific of Committee on the Effect of atomic Radiation, Effects and risks of ionizing radiation, United Nations, New York.	
Tashin, H.; Karvus, M.; Y, P.; Topuzoglu, A.; Hidiroglu, S. and Karahan, G. (2009): Radionuclide concentrations in soil and lifetime cancer risk due to gamma radioactivity in Kirklareli, Turkey. <i>J. Environ. Radioac.</i> , 100(1):49.		UNSCEAR (2021). United Nations Scientific of Committee on the effect of atomic Radiation, Effects of Atomic Radiation (2021) Report), United Nations, New York.	Comment [PA52]: Taskin ???
		UNSCEAR. (2021): Sources and Effects of Ionizing Radiation. Report to General Assembly, with	

Scientific Annexes. United Nations, New York.

UNSCEAR. (2021): Effects of ionizing radiation: report to the General Assembly, with scientific annexes (Vol. 1): United National Publications.

UNSCEAR (2021): Radiological Protection Bulletin, United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation No. 224, New York.

UNSCEAR (2021): Annex B: Exposures to Natural Radiation Sources Report to the general assembly with scientific annexes. United Nations

Scientific Committee on the effect of Atomic Radiation, New York.

UNSCEAR (2021): Source and effects of ionizing radiation report to the general assembly with scientific annexes. United Nations Scientific Committee on the effect of Atomic Radiation, New York.

UNSCEAR (2021): Radiological Protection Bulletin, United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation No. 46, New York.

USNRC (1996): Natural and man-made radiation source, New York.

**Comment [PA54]:** Too similar and have to be differentiated when citation

**Comment [PA55]:** Not cited

UNDER PEER REVIEW