

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reviews in Physics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJR2P_118585
Title of the Manuscript:	An overview of the measurements of primordial radionuclide concentrations in soil and radon concentrations in water samples
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalajr2p.com/index.php/AJR2P/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 review work highlights the measurements of primordial radionuclide concentrations in soil and radon concentrations in water samples in order to assess the radiation health hazards. The general readers will benefit from this review study.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>No.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>No.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This review study is generally well written, easy-to-read and to-follow. This paper has a potential to be accepted, but some important points have to be clarified or fixed before acceptance. This paper needs revision and as such it cannot be recommended for publication for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The structure of the abstract needs revision. Revise the abstract to provide: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the significance of the study, (ii) the gap analysis based on literature survey, (ii) the future directions of the study 2. The authors should provide key points and the contribution of the current study to the literature. The Introduction should make a compelling case for why the study is useful along with a clear statement of its importance by providing relevant information and providing answers to basic questions such as: What is already known in the open literature? What is missing (i.e., research gaps)? Add the research question of your review study at the end of the introduction section. 3. The authors did not mention anything about the energy calibration, efficiency calibration, energy resolution of the detector, geometry size of the sample container etc. The authors should provide some gamma-ray spectrum of soil and water samples from the literature survey. 4. The authors should provide the radioactive results on water samples graphically or in the Table. 5. The authors should elaborate in detail about the validation of the gamma-ray spectrometry method with the reference certified samples and its importance for radioactivity measurements. 6. The authors should add more recent relevant references. 7. The valuable discussions of the results from different countries are missing. I believe 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>that there is more information in the review results than the author has indicated.</p> <p>8. The conclusion is poor. It should be rewritten according to the significance of the review outcomes in the context of health hazards. The authors should identify the challenges due to the presence of radioactivity in soil and water samples. The authors should mention how to achieve the research question mentioned at the end of the introduction.</p> <p>9. There are some minor punctuation/grammatical errors and a general simplification/rewording is needed for some sentences.</p> <p>10. The paper merits publication after necessary modification/revision.</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:	Abdus Sattar Mollah
Department, University & Country	Military Institute of Science and Technology, Bangladesh