

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reviews in Physics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJR2P_126675
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Evaluation of Radioactive Contamination in Soil Samples from Mining and Non-Mining communities of Barkin Ladi Local Government Area, Plateau State
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript addresses a current problem in the Barkin Ladi area of Nigeria. Mining, generally, and especially mining of radioactive substances can be health threatening. This article takes part of the long list of articles published on the topic of radioactive pollution due to mining in Barkin Ladi area and demonstrates the risk to which those who live in these areas are exposed, and even analyzes the risk of plant contamination and the distribution of pollution in other areas of the country.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Nowadays radioactive pollution given by illegal mining is a real problem. Soil contamination, the destruction of the flora and fauna irreversibly lowers the quality of life of the people living in those areas. I found the article very interesting, also think that needs major corrections, maybe some extra details in the discussion section about how the contaminated soil affects the plants and animals in these regions. Also, a comparison between the present situation and other measurements like 10 years ago would be extraordinary to be presented. Put more accent on the problem, because the results show no pollution in this moment. As a scientist, I know is very important to prevent radioactive pollution. Although the subject is extremely important, the authors failed to convince me, that there is/was a real problem, which needs to be solved. The article needs more scientific and technical details.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	As a stranger, who never lived or travelled to Nigeria, I would like to see a better description of the Barkin Ladi area (I looked for it according to the coordinates, and did not find it). I would also like to see a more detailed scientific support of the risk of exposure to radioactive pollution. What happened to Barkin Ladi area because of the uncontrolled exploitation? Is there a general destruction of the flora and fauna? Why are these areas the most studied? Most of the articles which addresses similar subject use these 4 areas: Atoso, Nafan, Reppiyam and Kuppang. Are there mines only in Atoso and Nafam? Why are so important Reppiyam and Kuppang areas for comparison? Are these the farthest areas from the mining spots? Are there other options for comparison of the soil pollution? The mines use radioactive substances for gold mining, or there is also an exploitation of radioactive substances? What measures has the government introduced against pollution and illegal mining? Are there improvements regarding the soil situation in the region compared to previous years?	
Minor REVISION comments	Needs revision and minor to medium corrections	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Is there a newer report of UNSCEAR, 1988? I would like to see a comparison between the 1988 report and a newer one from 2020	

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:	Donath-Miklos Imola
Department, University & Country	Vasile Goldis` Western University, Romania