

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_97468
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF EXCESS LIFETIME CANCER RISK IN AT SOME SELECTED X-RAY DIAGNOSTIC CENTERS IN PORT HARCOURT, RIVERS 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:

<https://www.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. There are many grammar mistakes in abstract I will strongly advice that author should rewrite and should be understandable for scientific community.</p> <p>4. yes</p> <p>5. There are many problems about format and typesetting, such as no blank/more spcae space and no punctuation mark at the end of the figure captions as well as main body, please revise them in the whole article.</p> <p>6. References are not enough and neither recent. Author should cite some recent articles (last five years).</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript requires significant editing. The writing considerably hindered the review of the manuscript making it difficult to evaluate it for technical soundness.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In material and method section, author mention: three readings were recorded (at the entrance, the center of the X-ray room and X-ray scanning area) and the values were average to a single value and recorded. It is strongly advice that author should display all values in tabular form. Efficiency of the detector should be mentioned in the article.</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Waseem Akram
Department, University & Country	University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, China