

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reviews in Physics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJR2P_128386
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF BACKGROUND IONIZING RADIATION OF ENGINEERING LABORATORIES OF FEDERAL POLYTECHNIC NEKEDE OWERRI, IMO STATE.
Type of the 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: Comments

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p> <p>Content</p> <p>Observation</p> <p>Assessment of Background Ionizing Radiation of Engineering Laboratories of Federal Polytechnic Nekede Owerri, Imo State</p> <p>Abstract</p> <p>i. Faculty of Engineering Technology (FET)</p> <p>ii. The outdoor exposure dose rate varies from 0.006 - 0.017 mR/hr, 0.006 - 0.015 mR/hr, 0.008 - 0.015 mR/hr, 0.009 mR/hr with mean value of 0.011 mR/hr, 0.009 mR/hr, 0.014 mR/hr, 0.014 mR/hr for Computer Engineering Laboratory, Mechatronics Laboratory, Mechanical Engineering Laboratory and Automatic Laboratory and the indoor exposure dose varies from 0.009 - 0.015 mR/hr, 0.009 - 0.019</p> <p>General Comment on the Title and Abstract</p> <p>The title is unclear and does not effectively convey the author's intention.</p> <p>The abstract should be concise and structured to introduce the topic, clearly state the problem being addressed, outline the study's objectives, describe the research methods used, highlight key findings, and present the main conclusions. These essential elements are missing in the abstract. Instead, the author jumps directly into presenting the key findings without first stating the problem or objectives. As a result, important information has been</p>	<p>Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</p> <p>Comment</p> <p>The title could be made more specific by highlighting the purpose or intended outcomes of the study. To clarify the author's intentions, the title could be revised to reflect the potential implications of the assessment, such as safety concerns or regulatory compliance, which would provide a clearer focus for the reader.</p> <p>iii. The author can avoid repeating Faculty of Engineering Technology (FET) by using FET, as the author has already introduced it.</p> <p>iv. The range for 0.009 mR/hr is not shown. Are these values in relation to the mean values and the laboratories? If they are, this is not indicated in the text. The author should simplify the statement for clarity.</p> <p>v. No unit</p> <p>vi. The standard values must be shown in the text for easy comparison. Such is not seen.</p> <p>vii. Nekede is a noun</p>

Review Form 3

	<p>omitted, and the sentences are overly long. The abstract fails to clearly communicate the main goal of the study.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>Introduction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no number attached to the Introduction. The author should have written "1. Introduction," like the other headings. 2. The font sizes are not consistent. 3. The author's contribution is not evident in the introduction; it only cites references. <p>The reviewer doesn't see any background information about the study area, the problem the author is addressing, the objectives of the work, or its relevance.</p> <p>Materials and Methods</p> <p>2.1 Study Area</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Under Materials and Methods, the subheading for Study Area is labeled as 2.1, while Material is labeled as 3.1. The author needs to ensure consistency in the numbering format. 2. The figures are poorly labeled within the text and inadequately represented under the diagrams, particularly in the study area section. 3. The description of the study area is irrelevant to the work. The author discusses the establishment of the polytechnic and its relocation history, which does not add value or relevance to the study. <p>Effects of wind shear on flight operation in sam mbakwe airport imo State Ifeanyi Chris Onwuadiochi, Michael A Ijioma, Emmanuel Emeka Ezenwaji And Michael Chinedu Obikwelu</p> <p>3.1 Materials</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A well calibrated Radiation was utilized..... <p>The reviewer does not understand the meaning of this statement, as it lacks clarity and sufficient context. It is recommended that the author rephrase or elaborate on the statement to ensure it aligns with the study's objectives and conveys a clear, precise message to the reader.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is unclear and grammatically incorrect. The author seems to be missing crucial information. 	
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Review Form 3

	<p>General comment on this section</p> <p>. Health hazard indices</p> <p>Results And Discussion</p>	<p>3.2 Methods</p> <p>Study Area The section fails to contribute meaningfully to the work. Instead of addressing the study area in a way that aligns with the research objectives, the author provides irrelevant details about the establishment and relocation of the polytechnic. The reviewer expected a discussion of the study area that identifies factors contributing to the rise in background radiation, such as potential radiation-emitting facilities or equipment within the laboratories. This omission renders the section irrelevant and unhelpful to the study.</p> <p>Materials The entire section is unclear, particularly the first and second sentences. It requires revision for better clarity and coherence.</p> <p>Methods While the methodology uses standard practices (radiation meter and GPS), it does not appear to bring new techniques or approaches. A discussion of why this method is significant for this specific study area or how it advances existing research would add value. The Author should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly justify the selection of sampling points and explain their representation of the study area. Include a discussion of potential radiation sources in the laboratories (e.g., equipment or materials) to give context to the measurements. Address whether the measurements were taken under controlled conditions (e.g., same time of day, consistent laboratory activity levels). <p>Highlight any unique aspects of the methodology, such as how the data collected will contribute to a better understanding of background ionizing radiation in this setting.</p> <p>4.1 Absorbed Dose (D) 4.3 Equivalent Dose Rate (EDR) 4.5 Excess Life Cancer Risk (ELCR)</p>	<p>A more precise and clearer version might be:</p> <p>"A well-calibrated radiation detection instrument was utilized." The methodology uses standard practices, it does not appear to bring new techniques or approaches.</p> <p>The author should discuss why this method is significant for this specific study area or how it advances existing research that would add value.</p> <p>Equations are not numbered. Equation font sizes are not the same. The author needs to ensure consistency in the numbering format. The author should provide a brief explanation or comment</p>
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Review Form 3

	<p>“Table 1 to Table 8”</p>	<p>for each table and figure in the text.</p> <p>The font sizes of the figures should be checked for consistency.</p> <p>Tables 1 to 7" appear in the discussion section.</p> <p>There is little discussion or analysis of the figures themselves.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses the critical issue of background ionizing radiation in educational and research facilities, specifically within engineering laboratories. The study's findings can contribute valuable insights into the potential radiation exposure risks for staff and students in such environments, thereby highlighting the need for safety protocols and monitoring systems. Additionally, the manuscript provides a foundation for future research on radiation management and the development of strategies to mitigate risks in academic and industrial settings. Understanding the levels of ionizing radiation in these spaces can aid in the formulation of policies to ensure safe working conditions and protect public health.</p>		
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>No is not suitable. Assessment of background radiation levels in engineering laboratories at Federal Polytechnic Nekede Owerri, Imo state: implications for safety and compliance</p>		
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract should be concise and structured to introduce the topic, clearly state the problem being addressed, outline the study's objectives, describe the research methods used, highlight key findings, and present the main conclusions. These essential elements are missing in the abstract. Instead, the author jumps directly into presenting the key findings without first stating the problem or objectives. As a result, important information has been omitted, and the sentences are overly long. The abstract fails to clearly communicate the main goal of the study.</p>		
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The manuscript does not bring any scientific innovation. The study area does not identify the factors contributing to the rise in background radiation, such as potential radiation-emitting facilities or equipment within the laboratories. This omission renders the section irrelevant and unhelpful to the study. While the methodology uses standard practices (radiation meter and GPS), it does not appear to bring new techniques or approaches. A discussion of why this method is significant for this specific study area or how it advances existing research would add value. Some sections are not clear.</p>		
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The format of the references is not consistent; some list the authors' names first, while others list the authors' initials first.</p>		

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality should be check.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The research paper requires a major revision before it can be considered suitable for publication. Several key areas need improvement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The research paper lacks a clear delivery of the problem being addressed and the study's objectives. These are crucial for guiding the reader through the research process and establishing the study's significance. 2. The abstract should be more structured, presenting the problem, objectives, methodology, key findings, and conclusions in a concise manner. It should not dive directly into findings without first outlining the context and purpose. 3. The description of the study area seems irrelevant, focusing more on the history of the institution rather than factors contributing to background radiation. This section should be revised to directly relate to the study's focus on radiation sources in the laboratories. 4. While the methodology provides some insight, it lacks clarity in terms of how the measurements were specifically carried out, and there is no mention of potential sources of radiation within the labs. It should also be clearer in its structure and flow. 5. The figures and tables need proper labeling and more context in the text. Brief comments or explanations for each figure/table should be included to help readers interpret the data. 6. There are inconsistencies in the writing, referencing format, and presentation of data. The paper should follow a uniform format throughout. 7. The conclusion does not appear to align with the objectives of the study, which is a critical issue. The conclusion should summarize how the research addresses the stated objectives and problem. 	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Sylvester Attakorah Birikorang</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Texas A&M University, United States of America</p>