

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Physical and Chemical Sciences</a>
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	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> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No, it needs thorough revision</p> <p>No, it needs thorough revision</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>References are inadequate, I have made suggestion already</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>English is poor and need improvement through a thorough grammar checker</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Review Reports            Manuscript title: MEASUREMENT OF OUTDOOR AND INDOOR BACKGROUND IONIZING RADIATION OF O.B. LULU BRIGGS HEALTH CENTER, UNIVERSITY OF PORT HARCOURT, CHOBA, RIVERS STATE            Manuscript No: Ms_AJOPACS_101846            The authors analyzed the risk assessment of exposure to ionizing radiation from the indoor and outdoor levels at a University health facility in Port Harcourt.            Reviewer #:</p> <p>1. The abstract is not complete, normally a good abstract, regardless of the number of words should include introduction to the field of research, problem, methodology, objective, results and conclusion. In case of the present manuscript no introduction to the field of research, problem statement, and the methodology. However, the sampling tool as well as results and conclusion are adequately presented. Re-write the abstract to capture all these.</p> <p>2. The aim and objectives are clearly stated but the justification still needs to be improved, especially in the comparison with available related studies and why chose to carry out the study at the mentioned hospital, this aspect should be discussed.</p> <p>3. The introduction is well written but still need improvement. This research area has gain a lot of prominence over time across the globe. The authors should cite more classic authors in the introductory section, preferably recent works between 2015-date, and avoid over depending on author (6); elaborate on the potential organ effects of exposure to ionizing radiation. Authors should consult and also cite DOI: 10.12691/ijp-5-5-3 which can be of help in this aspect. Some of the references cited are outdated.</p> <p>4. The study areas are well described</p> <p>5. The methodology is also well presented capable of replicability. However, section 3.1-3.5 is continuation of methodology and not results as you reported. Authors should start results from the tables. They do not annex information in supplementary material where they obtained the results by</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p>the proposed equations, they show the equations but there is no way to verify them. Please it will be good if the supplementary file can be attached if possible.</p> <p>6. Authors should try to correlate the mean results in Tables 1 and 2. The DOI recommended before can also help here.</p> <p>7. The overall structure of the manuscript is good.</p> <p>8. Authors reported that the testes are more susceptible to risk (highest organ dose) but could not explain why it is so. Please clarify for better understanding.</p> <p>9. Finally, the English is poor and can be improved through a thorough grammar checker. I go with the decision of MAJOR revision is necessary.</p> <p>Manuscript need REVISION</p>	
--	--	--

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Tyoyima Ayua John</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of The Gambia, The Gambia</b>