

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_119133
Title of the Manuscript:	Determination of Natural Radioactivity Levels and Radiation Hazards from the Soil of Tin Mining in Kyerwa District, Tanzania
Type of the Article	paper

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>)

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>Compulsory 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>This paper provides useful information of natural radioactivity levels of soil of an area of Tin mining in Tanzania.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Re-writing is required. The units used for various radiological parameters are found incorrect. [e.g. Abstract: Iy can't be 0.831 Bq/kg, AGED value of 2984Sv/y, so on]. There is inconsistent of using unit in the text as well.</p> <p>Re-modification is required. Methods of evaluation of radiological parameters should be placed in Section 2, material and methods part. In the result section, only the outcome of the study should be placed. Comparison with other studies is suggested in discussion section.</p> <p>Yes, but after the modification as suggested.</p> <p>A few recent papers addressed with the similar studies may be included in the references.</p> <p>The paper is required well organized. The following points need to be incorporated before it is considered for further review.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In Tables and the text, the activities should be presented without any decimal, as well as the DR (nGy/h). The AEDE (mGy/y), Hex, Hin and Iy values may be given in one decimal. 2. Many times author used the word "recommendation reference level" of radioactivity in soil. Whereas, UNSCEAR (2000) is giving, world average value of soil for 226Ra, 232Th & 40K as 35, 30 and 400 Bq/Kg. It can' be recommendation reference level. Correct this part in the text as well. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It is okay.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>General comment: I would strongly appreciate if author would state that any values that exceed the worldwide average by less than a factor of 10 are NOT "critical", are NOT a risk, are part of the daily life.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Brahmacharimayum Arunkumar Sharma
Department, University & Country	Regional Institute of Medical Sciences, Imphal, India