

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_109769
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF CHEMICAL AND RADIOLOGICAL IMPACTS OF RADIONUCLIDES IN BOREHOLE WATERS IN IGBAJO TOWN, OSUN STATE, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> 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.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is very important for scientific community but needs editing to faction well for global academic exploration. The authors actually did a good research work but they should use this article to improve their work "Ecological and health risk assessment of radionuclides and heavy metals of surface and ground water of Ishiagu – Ezillo quarry sites of Ebonyi, Southeast Nigeria".</p> <p>2. the title of the article is suitable for the proposed write up</p> <p>3. the abstract is not comprehensive enough, it needs further improvement to capture the aim and objectives of the study</p> <p>4. the structure of the manuscript is not yet appropriate- the equation should be written using equation editor and the numbering of the equation should be done using numbers and not roman numerals. Again, some of the equations should be looked into to check their accuracy as I noticed incorrect equations. The authors also dwell mostly on old references for their write up instead of recent published articles to improve their work.</p> <p>5. the scientific authenticity of the manuscript requires minor improvement to be good</p> <p>6. the references are not sufficient and recent; the authors should include additional references of five years' interval.</p> <p>7. there are lots of grammatical errors which need to be improved using Grammarly editor or English proof reader</p> <p>8. there were no subsections in results and discussion part</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English language quality of the article should be improved for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The authors did a good work but need minor revision to improve the standard of the article for academic global conviction</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:	<b>Umeh Chisom Theresa</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Nigeria</b>