

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_97095
Title of the Manuscript:	ESTIMATION OF RADON CONCENTRATION AROUND PUBLIC SPACES AND RESIDENTIAL HOMES WITH ALTITUDE WITHIN CITIES OF DELTA 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.journalpsij.com/index.php/PSIJ/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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)	The manuscript is important for the scientific community The title is suitable The abstract will be more comprehensive if a summary of the method of measurement was included The subsections and structure are appropriate The manuscript is scientifically correct The references are sufficient but the authors should pay attention to some of the citations	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript will benefit greatly by a thorough review by an English language professional.	
Optional/General comments	Figure 3 should contain a key to differentiate research finding from WHO values Authors should indicate a note on the method used in selecting the cities where the study was carried out.	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Martha Orendu Oche Attah
Department, University & Country	Cyprus International University, Nigeria