

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Physical and Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOPACS_101846
Title of the Manuscript:	MEASUREMENT OF OUTDOOR AND INDOOR BACKGROUND IONIZING RADIATION OF O.B. LULU BRIGGS HEALTH CENTER, UNIVERSITY OF PORT HARCOURT, CHOBA, RIVERS STATE
Type of the 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)
--	---------------------------	--

Review Form 1.7

<p><u>Compulsory</u> 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>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>excellent</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>NONE</p> <p>It is important to always give the full name of the agent / method BEFORE the abbreviations, what has been already generally done. Everything is great.</p> <p>ABSTRACT</p> <p>The authors' studies and measurements refer to near the oceans. The entry requirements were precisely introduced in the abstract, including the geographic location, which is close to the hygric equator with 4°54'06.6"N 6°54'32.4"E. It is very personal and good to indicate the university, The University Of Port Harcourt, P.M.B 5323, Choba Rivers State., The Republic of Nigeria. The reader has an accurate reference as to where the research was conducted.</p> <p>It would be important to state the abbreviations, e. g. BIR, is it `Basic Instrument Rating (BIR)` introduced by Regulation (EU) 2020/359 and published in March 2020 ?</p> <p>The measurement of the background radiation is very important and attracts the interest of the readers. However, I would recommend not putting too much data before in the abstract, otherwise readers will be inclined not to study the full document. But that is good.</p> <p>KEYWORDS</p> <p>These very well and clearly selected</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>The absorption of energy over a very long-time results to tissue damage and disruption in cellular function at the molecular levels; this a very great and important argument. A correlation to the environment causing the effects on the human body - or other individuals is clearly mentioned. Exposure to chronic exposure leading to sterility and cancer and other implications was specifically</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>emphasized in the introduction and is of great medical importance. It is to emphasize the very meaningful data, measured and given with a very high degree of accuracy, even include the mR/h – `1 Roentgen´ is defined in Coulomb / Kilogram [C / kg] and can be compared well with the usual in unit this area with `Sievert´, 1 sv [J / kg]. Hence, the ion unit can take exactly into account. What means “nGy/ h” ?, is it nano Gray per hour ?, right: (m/s)² – in physics similar to the unit of sv. United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effect of Atomic Radiation (UNSCEAR), why ? This is clear !</p> <p>MATERIALS AND METHODS</p> <p>The methods and experimental procedure are very well prepared and can be understood as an experiment at any time. The results were reported with accuracy and detail. A geographic map is also included so that the reader can immediately understand the location of the measurements in `Lulu Briggs Health Centre´, a good reference to medical professionals dealing with the mission in this field.</p> <p>RESULTS</p> <p>These are given in Equivalent Dose Rate (EDR), Absorbed Dose Rate (ADR), Annual Effective Dose Equivalent (AEDE), and Excess Lifetime Cancer Risk (ELCR). These techniques also allow the assessment over a longer (extended) period of time, crucial for the effect of the radiation, otherwise it would make no sense. The cancer risk induced by exposure to ionizing radiation has been calculated using mathematical equations. An evaluation in this way is very important for treatment in hospitals and helpful to support any prediction and prevention. The Tables 1-4 are just as meaningful and very accurate together with the deviations in the presented experiments. The data are understandable to read, even for people outside this area.</p> <p>CITATIONS</p> <p>In this manuscript, the authors have quoted meaningful writings, not too much, but clearly and importantly.</p>	
--	--	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tom George Manfred de la Rue-Gerlitz
Department, University & Country	The University of Panamá, Panamá