Original Research Article

ASSESSMENT OF THE(consider removing THE) ACTIVITY CONCENTRATION OF RADIONUCLIDES IN SOIL AND FOOD CROPS (state the root crop under consideration) FROM SOLID MINERAL MINING SITE IN ISHIAGU(state the LGA), EBONYI STATE

ABSTRACT

The assessment of the activity of concentration of radionuclides in soil and food crops from solid mineral mining sites at Ishiagu(state the LGA), Ebonyi State was carried out using appropriate equipment(rephrase). Samples of soil and cassava crop (were) collected from around the mining sites, fifty (50) meters away from the site (and were) was analysed using gamma ray spectrometry(Spectrometer). (name the radionuclides detected first)The average activity concentration of ^{226}Ra, ^{232}Th and ^{40}K in soil samples(were) are 12.37,16.08, and 144.29 Bqkg^{-1} while those for cassava are (were) 2.81, 16.80, and 205.41 Bqkg^{-1}. The soil/plant radionuclide transfer ratio estimated (were)are 0.62, 2.43 and 2.51 for ^{226}Ra, ^{232}Th and ^{40}K, respectively. All the radiological risk parameters estimated are relatively low. The result of this work shows(showed) that the obtained results for all samples (were)are lower than the international accepted limit. Hence, from radiological health standpoint, the obtained values of effective doses do (may) not pose significant threat to both human system and the environment.

Keywords: Gamma Spectrometer, NaI(IT) detector, Ro-tap shaker, Radionuclides, Excess Lifetime Cancer Risk, Annual Gonadal Equivalent Dose.

INTRODUCTION

Generally speaking, man is exposed to radioisotopes from different sources, which can be generated either naturally or through man-made activities like mining. Mining sites and its environs where heavy metal ores are extracted and may be processed has the potential of high radiation emission due to exposure of some certain radioactive substances. When harmful substances are introduced into the system and the environment becomes polluted, it affects man and his environment adversely [2]. When man eats foods from crops that are cultivated in an environment with high radionuclides concentration, it exposes man to radionuclide radiation [6]. Therefore, it is very important to have the knowledge of radionuclide radiation levels in grown food crops(rephrase), since it can be used to determine dosage received by man.

Though it is possible to determine the level of food crops contamination through the magnitude (of) radioactivity in soil, but it cannot be used to evaluate the effects of radiation exposure to the person who eats that food(rephrase scientifically). Therefore, the calculation of doses is determined for evaluating health safety of a person undergoing radiation exposure through consumption of infected food (check grammar).

The rate at which these foods are consumed and the amount of radionuclide content in these food crops determines the intake of the radionuclides or the exposure rate. The danger related to the consumption of radionuclides in the body is corresponding (use another world) to the sum of the dose delivered by radioisotopes while occupying different organs of the body. Usually, it is presumed that stochastic effects takes place linearly with dose and in general the annual effective dose quantities are used to explain those risks when lengthened exposure in a person from a single consumption of a radioisotope is being weighed. The continues extraction mining (mining activities) of lead/zinc in lshiagu exposes the people working in the site and people leaving (living) around the area to great health danger. These areas are also cultivated and in these crops like rice, cassava and maize are grown around there. These crops are harvested and consumed annually by the people, hence the need to ascertain the activity concentration of radioisotopes in the soil, determine soil to crop uptake and thereby ascertain the health effect on to the people.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study Area

Ishiagu village is situated in Ivo LGA of Ebonyi State. It is found between latitude 5°54' – 5°59' N and longitudes 7°30' – 7°35' E. The area coverages (about 25 sq.km), is located in the south-west part of the Abakaliki Basin, in Eastern part of Nigeria and is comprised of a low-lying sedimentary terrain with some encroachment on different occurrences [7]. The Pb-Zn deposits in Ishiagu area appear to be the southern limit of mineralization in the Benue Trough and the Pb-Zn mineralized zone extends over a distance of 500 km in a narrow belt from Isiagu in the lower Benue Trough to Zurek in the upper Benue Trough, likewise the extent of igneous intrusions in the Benue Trough. Majority of the geologic and topographic features of the area align in the NW-SE direction, and conform to orientation of the folds from the Santonianorogenic deformation. Geologic model of Pb-Zn mineralization in Ishiagu. The sediments of lead/zinc in Ishiagu constitute the basic part of Benue Trough sedimentary basin development and the policies for exploring them must consider the relevant geological model. The Isiagu lead/zinc mineralization is credited to geological model formed on the geotectonic environment, the method of development and fluid inclusion features. (add ref)



Figure 1: Map of Ishiagu showing sampling points

NOTE: This map does not represent the sample locations sufficiently, all the geological features represented in the map has no connection with the topic under consideration. Please represent all the sample locations in the map and add only the geological features relevant to your work in the map

Samples collection and preparation

In order to assess the activity concentration of radionuclides in soil and food crops from solid mineral mining site in Ishiagu, Ebonyi State, various methods (all I see here is one method, please check) were employed and some discussed below. The materials used in this study includes: global positioning system (GPS), ro-tap shaker, gamma-ray NaI (TI) detector

Fifteen (15) surface soil samples and fifteen (15) cassava roots were collected from the mining site for study (State where each sample was collected from in the study area). Surface specimens were taken because surface materials are most significant for wind-borne transport, human exposure and direct contact with precipitation and surface run off. The samples were placed inside labeled bags and sealed, processed and grinded and then transported to the laboratory for further processes. Soil and cassava were collected for analysis from 15 locations. (SND stands for sand while CAS stands for cassava). The soil and cassava samples were later sealed in a well labeled black polythene bag to avoid cross contamination. The collected soil and cassava specimens were subjected to test in the Physics laboratory at Federal University of Agriculture, Abeokuta for specific activity concentration measurement.

Fifteen (15) samples of soil and cassava each were subjected to spectrometric analysis using sodium iodide NaI (TI) spectrometer. (State the mass of the samples used)

The soil and cassava samples were prepared for gamma analysis by drying overnight in the electric oven at 115^{0C}. The samples were mechanically crushed and sieved through 0.8mm mesh sieve. The sieved portion of the samples was(were) transferred into a 100ml Marinelli beaker (beaker was not mentioned in your materials) for gamma spectrometry and sealed for four weeks to attain secular equilibrium between the uliradium(check spelling) contents of the samples and their decay product before analysis using the NaI (TI) gamma spectrometer. The NaI(TI) is a 2″×2″ Sodium iodide detector coupled to an ORTEC 456 digiBase multichannel analyzer (MCA). The digiBase is connected to a computer with a USB cable. Accumulation and analysis of the gamma-ray spectrum were carried out with the computer using the ORTEC Mestro Software. The counting (accumulation) time was 10800 seconds. The detector was installed in a 15cm thick cylindrical lead shield to reduce influence of background radiation.

The standard materials from the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) were used for calibration (State the standard). From the counting spectra, the activity concentrations of radium ^{226}Ra, thorium ^{232}Th and potassium ^{40}K was determined using the software (add ref).

Activity concentrations and radiological hazard parameter calculation

Effective Dose (Number your headings)

Effective dose (that is the quantity of radiation dose) is the tissue-weighted sum of the equivalent doses in all specified tissues and organs of the body and represents the stochastic health risk, which is the probability of cancer induction and genetic effects of ionizing radiation delivered to those body parts (are these the only possible risk associated with high dose? Rephrase to capture all). It takes into account the type of radiation and the nature of each organ or tissue being irradiated over a period of l year. This was calculated from the Alpha activity result.

The effective dose is given as

$$DR_w = A_w \, x \, IR_w \, x \, 1DF \quad (1)$$

Where;
DR_w is the effective dose (mSv),
A_w = activity ($Bq1^{-1}$)
IRw =intake of water for person in 1year (adult =730 liters) (infant =200 liters)
IDF = ingestion effective dose equivalent weighting factors $3.58x10^{-7}SvBq^{-1}$ [14].
These parameters are Radium equivalent activity, annual gonnadal equivalent dose, external hazard index, internal hazard index, representative gamma index, excess lifetime cancer exposure rate and the radiogenic heat production.

Radium Equivalent Activity (appropriate numbering of your headings is required)
Radium equivalent (Ra compare the specific activities of materials containing by a quantity and responsible for the dangers that are linked with the measured radionuclide [3]. The index is very profitable in controlling safe allowable standards.
The radium equivalent activity equals a weighted sum of activities of natural radionuclides (Uranium, Thorium, Potassium) and is based on the estimation that l Bq/kg of ^{226}Ra, 0.7Bq/kg of ^{232}Th, and l3BqIkg of ^{40}K produce the same radiation dose rates.
The radium equivalent activity index is given below as [4];

$$\mathbf{Ra_{eq} = C_{Ra} + 1.43C_{Th} + 0.077C_k} \quad (2)$$

Where; C_{Ra}, C_{Th}, C_K, are the radioactivity concentration in Bq/Kg of ^{238}U, ^{232}Th, and ^{40}K.
Every material whose Ra_{eq} concentration exceeds 37Bq/kg is strongly advised not to be used [8].

Annual Gonnadal Equivalent Dose (AGED)
Protecting the organs of the gonads, the bone marrow and the bone surface cells is of key importance to the radiation community [12]. The AGED is given as;

$$\mathbf{AGED\ (Sv/yr) = 3.09C_{Ra} + 4.18C_{Th} + 0.314C_K} \quad (3)$$

Where C_{Ra}, C_{Th}, and C_K are the radioactivity concentration of ^{238}U, ^{232}Th, and ^{40}K.

External Hazard Index
Most radioisotopes naturally exist in terrestrial soils and rocks and upon decay, man is exposed to their environmental radiation field effect. In terms of the dose, the major primordial radioisotopes are ^{238}U, ^{232}Th, and ^{40}K [1].
The external hazard index (H_{ex}) can be calculated as [4].

$$H_{ex} = \frac{C_{Ra}}{370} + \frac{C_{Th}}{259} + \frac{C_K}{4810} \quad (4)$$

Where C_{Ra}, C_{Th}, C_k are the radioactivity concentrations in Bq/Kg of ^{238}U, ^{232}Th, and ^{40}K respectively. The result obtained from the index must be lower than one for the radiation hazard to be insignificant. [4].
When the index is equivalent to one, it represents the upper limit of Raeq (370Bq/Kg) [4].

Internal Hazard Index'l
The internal hazard index (H_{in}) is calculated as [4].

$$H_{in} = \frac{C_{Ra}}{185} + \frac{C_{Th}}{259} + \frac{C_K}{4810} \quad (5)$$

H_{in} should be lower than one for the radiation hazard to be insignificant. Internal exposure to randon are extremely dangerous, this can lead to respiratory diseases like asthma and cancer.

Representative Gamma Index (l_{yr})
This is used to estimate the γ- radiation hazard associated with the natural radionuclide in specific investigated samples, [1]. The representative gamma index is given as .

$$H_{yr} = \frac{C_{Ra}}{150} + \frac{C_{Th}}{100} + \frac{C_K}{1500} \quad (6)$$

This gamma index is also used to correlate the annual dose rate due to the excess external gamma radiation caused by superficial materials [1]. This is a tool used to find out materials that might portray health problem when used for construction.
Values of $I_{yr} \leq 1$ is equivalent to an annual effective dose of less than or equal to lmSv, while $I_{yr} \leq 0.5$ is equivalent to annual effective dose less or equal to 0.3mSv [11].

Excess Lifetime Cancer Risk (ELCR)

This deals with the probability of developing cancer over a lifetime at a given exposure level. It is presented as a value representing the number of extra cancers expected in a given number of people on exposure to a carcinogen at a given dose. Excess lifetime cancer risk (ELCR) is given as [10].

ELCR=AEDE x DL x RF (7)

Where AEDE is the Annual Effective Dose Equivalent,
DL is average Duration of Life (70years), and
RF is the Risk Factor i.e. fatal cancer risk per Sievert. For stochastic effects, ICRP uses RF as 0.05 for the public [10].

Annual Effective Dose Equivalent (AEDE) For Outdoor
The annual effective dose equivalent received outdoor by a member is given as, [1]

AEDE (Outdoor) (μSv/y) = ADR (nGy/h) x 8760h x 0.7Sv/Gy x 0.2 x 10^{-3} (8)

This hazard index keeps control on the effects of radiation on reproductive organs.

Activity Utilization Index
This is the parametric model that enables us determine the dose rates in air of the radionuclides (K, Ra, Th) from the soil samples. This is given as, [9];

$$AUI = \frac{A_u}{50} XFu + \frac{A_{Th}}{20} XF_{Th} + \frac{A_K}{500} XF_k \quad \textbf{(9)}$$

Where, A_u, A_{Th} and A_k are activity concentration in Bq/kg for ^{238}U, ^{232}Th and ^{40}K.
F_u, F_{Th}, and F_k are the fractional contributions to the total dose rate in air due to gamma radiation from the actual concentrations of these radionuclides, [9]. The values of F_uF_{Th}, and F_x are given as 0.462, 0.604 and 0.041 for uranium, thorium and potassium respectively. Substituting the fractional contributions values, the equation becomes;

$$AUI = \frac{A_u}{50} X\ 0.462 + \frac{A_{Th}}{50} X\ 0.604 + \frac{A_K}{500} X\ 0.041 \quad \textbf{(10)}$$

AUI less than 2 corresponds to an annual effective dose of <0.3 mSv/y which is safe for the environment [9].

Estimation of soil-to-plant transfer factor (TF)

IAEA has already approved a procedure mapped out for protocol developed by the Working Group of International Union of Radio ecologists for standardizing the rooting depth to describe soil to plant transfer factor. A generally acceptable soil layer was accepted in this work. For grass, this soil depth value is 10 cm and for all other crops (including fruit trees) it is assumed as 20 cm. Using [5] guidelines, the soil-to-plant transfer factor TF was estimated as:

$$TF = \frac{C_p}{C_a} \quad \textbf{(11)}$$

where C p = radionuclide concentration in plant ($Bqkg^{-1}$) and Ca = radionuclide concentration in soil ($Bqkg^{-1}$) .

RESULTS

The results of the activity concentrations of radionuclides ^{40}K, ^{226}Ra and ^{232}Th in soil are presented in Table 1. While the comparison of the calculated radiation hazard indices with standards are presented in Table 4. The soil/plant transfer ratio is presented in Table 5.

Table 1. Radionuclide Concentration on Soil

S/N	Location	Activity concentration ($BqKg^{-1}$)		
		^{40}K	^{226}Ra	^{232}Th
1	SND1	447.27	12.59	7.38
2	SND2	30.57	22.72	30.57
3	SND3	378.12	3.18	26.13
4	SND4	34.21	BDL	29.35
5	SND5	70.60	16.47	16.91
6	SND6	125.19	2.61	17.22
7	SND7	185.24	4.78	13.32
8	SND8	113.28	9.12	16.06
9	SND9	66.96	20.70	14.47
10	SND10	190.70	19.11	6.77
11	SND11	48.77	8.39	11.11
12	SND12	68.78	24.17	13.01
13	SND13	161.58	9.97	19.66
14	SND14	88.80	6.22	15.15
15	SND15	154.31	3.18	4.03
	Mean	144.29	12.37	16.08
	UNSCEAR (2000)	400	35	30

BDL = Below Detectable Level



Fig. 2. Radionuclide Concentration on Soil

Table 2. Radionuclide concentration in Cassava

		Activity concentration ($BqKg^{-1}$)		
S/N	**Location**	**^{40}K**	**^{226}Ra**	**^{232}Th**
1	CAS1	411.10	BDL	24.61
2	CAS 2	131.41	15.98	20.14
3	CAS 3	255.72	BDL	39.87
4	CAS 4	161.01	BDL	19.53
5	CAS 5	140.29	BDL	BDL
6	CAS 6	159.53	BDL	23.19
7	CAS 7	78.14	BDL	BDL
8	CAS 8	184.69	BDL	6.22
9	CAS 9	499.89	11.68	32.34
10	CAS 10	138.81	BDL	39.46
11	CAS 11	424.42	BDL	4.27
12	CAS 12	121.05	14.44	0.81
13	CAS 13	124.01	BDL	BDL
14	CAS 14	137.33	BDL	BDL
15	CAS 15	109.21	BDL	41.50
	Mean	205.41	2.81	16.80

BDL = Below Detectable Level

Table 3. Hazard Indices

Location	Raeq (Bq/Kg)	Iγ ($mSvy^{-1}$)	Hex ($mSvy^{-1}$)	Hin ($mSvy^{-1}$)	D ($nGyh^{-1}$)	AEDE ($mSvy^{-1}$)	Gonadal (μSvy^{-1})	ELCR x 10^{-3}	AUI ($mSvy^{-1}$)
SND1	492.27	0.46	0.16	0.19	29.05	0.04	0.21	0.09	0.56
SND2	76.64	0.48	0.19	0.25	30.76	0.04	0.21	0.09	0.60
SND3	444.61	0.53	0.19	0.20	33.47	0.04	0.24	0.10	0.65
SND4	78.82	0.32	0.12	0.12	19.65	0.02	0.13	0.06	0.38
SND5	100.22	0.33	0.12	0.17	21.06	0.03	0.14	0.06	0.41
SND6	159.45	0.27	0.10	0.11	17.11	0.02	0.12	0.05	0.33
SND7	218.55	0.29	0.10	0.12	18.20	0.02	0.13	0.06	0.35
SND8	144.97	0.30	0.11	0.13	18.91	0.02	0.13	0.06	0.37
SND9	92.81	0.33	0.13	0.18	21.34	0.03	0.15	0.07	0.42
SND10	215.06	0.32	0.12	0.17	20.98	0.03	0.15	0.06	0.41
SND11	68.41	0.20	0.08	0.10	12.81	0.02	0.09	0.04	0.25
SND12	92.69	0.34	0.13	0.20	22.12	0.03	0.15	0.07	0.44
SND13	202.13	0.44	0.16	0.22	28.17	0.03	0.19	0.09	0.55
SND14	117.30	0.25	0.09	0.11	15.98	0.02	0.11	0.05	0.31
SND15	171.95	0.16	0.06	0.06	10.41	0.01	0.08	0.03	0.20
Mean	178.39	0.33	0.12	0.15	21.34	0.03	0.15	0.07	0.42
UNSCEAR (2000)	370	1	1	1	60	1	0.30	0.29	1



Fig. 3. Comparison of Radium Equivalent concentration in with all the location.



Fig. 4. Comparison of Gamma index in Soil with world average in all the locations.



Fig. 5. Comparison of external hazard index in Soil with world average in all the locations.



Fig. 6. Comparison of internal hazard index in Soil with world average in all the locations.



Fig. 7. Comparison of Absorbed Dose Rate in Soil with world average in all the locations.



Fig.8 Comparison of Annual effective dose equivalent in Soil with world average in all the locations.



Fig. 9. Comparison of annual gonadal equivalent dose in Soil with world average in all the locations.



Fig.10. Comparison of excess life cancer risk in Soil with world average in all the locations.



Fig. 11 Comparison of Activity utilization index in Soil with world average in all the location.

Table 4: Soil /plant transfer ratio

Location	Plant	T/F (^{40}K)	T/F (^{226}Ra)	T/F (^{232}Th)
SND1	CAS1	0.92	BDL	3.33
SND2	CAS2	4.30	0.703086	0.66
SND3	CAS3	0.68	BDL	1.53
SND4	CAS4	4.71	BDL	0.67
SND5	CAS5	1.99	BDL	BDL
SND6	CAS6	1.27	BDL	1.35
SND7	CAS7	0.42	BDL	BDL
SND8	CAS8	1.63	BDL	0.39
SND9	CAS9	7.47	0.564095	2.24
SND10	CAS10	0.73	BDL	5.83
SND11	CAS11	8.70nhb	BDL	0.38
SND12	CAS12	1.76	0.597429	0.06
SND13	CAS13	0.77	BDL	BDL
SND14	CAS14	1.55	BDL	BDL
SND15	CAS15	0.71	BDL	10.30
AVERAGE		**2.51**	**0.62**	**2.43**

BDL = Below Detectable Level

(Discussion should be here as a heading)

The mean activity concentration of ^{40}K, ^{226}Ra and ^{232}Th in soil from the studied areas are 144.29 $Bqkg^{-1}$, 12.37 $Bqkg^{-1}$ and 16.08 $Bqkg^{-1}$ respectively. The largest contribution of the overall activity concentration in soil comes mainly from ^{40}K (State the consequences of this if there is). The obtained mean values in soil of ^{40}K, ^{226}Ra and ^{232}Th, when compared with standard value limit of Thorium (30 $Bqkg^{-1}$), Radium (35 $Bqkg^{-1}$) and Potassium (400 $Bqkg^{-1}$) are were below the standard limit.

The representative index, external hazard index, internal hazard index and annual effective dose equivalent AEDE (outdoor) in soil samples are calculated. The obtained results are as shown in Table 4. When compared with [12] standard of allowable limit of 1.0 $mSvy^{-1}$ for soil, it is observed that the obtained results for all samples are lower than the international accepted limit. Hence, from radiological health standpoint, the obtained values of effective doses do not (may not) pose significant threat to both human system and the environment.

The soil to plant average transfer ratio calculated of ^{40}K, ^{226}Ra and ^{232}Th are were 2.5, 0.6 and 2.43 respectively. The transfer ratio in ^{40}K was higher in majority of the location samples than the ones obtained from ^{226}Ra and ^{232}Th. This result may not be unconnected with the fact that ^{40}K have accumulated from the soil through the root uptake over a long time.

The analysis of activity concentration of radionuclides presence in soil was also carried out. The radionuclides identified in the soil are were ^{226}Ra, ^{232}Th and ^{40}K. The radiation hazard indices were obtained from the measured radionuclide concentration and the results in all showed that the activity concentration were is lower than the world average. The values are were 12.37, 16.08 and 144.29 for are ^{226}Ra, ^{232}Th and ^{40}K respectively as against 35, 30 and 400 world average (ref for the world average).

Summarize the conclusion of your work with a heading here and state your recommendation if any

COMPETING INTERESTS DISCLAIMER:

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist. The products used for this research are commonly and predominantly use products in our area of research and country. There is absolutely no conflict of interest between the authors and producers of the products because we do not intend to use these products as an avenue for any litigation but for the advancement of knowledge. Also, the research was not funded by the producing company rather it was funded by personal efforts of the authors.

REFERENCE

1. Avwiri, G., Osimobi, J. & Agbalagba, E. (2012). Evaluation of Radiation Hazard Indices and Excess Lifetime Cancer Risk Due to Natural Radioactivity in soil profile of Udi and Ezeagu Local Government Areas of Enugu State, Nigeria. *Comprehensive Journal of Environmental and Earth Sciences. 1(1), 1-10.*

2. Avwiri, G. O., Osimobi, J.C. & Agbalagba, E.O., (2013). Evaluation of Natural Occurring Radionuclide Variation with Lithology Depth Profile of Udi and Ezeagu Local Government Areas of Enugu State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Engineering and Applied Sciences. 4; (3) 234-239.*

3. Baratta, E.J. (1990). *Radon, radium and uranium in drinking water*. Lewis publisher, Washington DC, pp 203-213.

4. Beretka, J., Matthew, P.J. (1985). National radioactivity of Australian Building materials in industrial wastes and by products. *Journal of health physics* 48:87-95.

5. IAEA(1996). International basic safety standards for protection against ionizing radiation and for safety of radiation sources, safety series no.115.IAEA, Vienna.

6. Leonid, L. N. & Najat, K. M. (2014). Determination of radioactivity in maize and mung beans grown in the neighborhood of Minjingu phosphate mine, Tanzania. *Tanzania Journal of Science* 40(1).

7. Mbah, V., Onwuemesi, A., Aniwetalu, E. (2015). Exploration of Lead-Zinc Mineralization Using Very Low Frequency Electromagnetic (VLF-EM) in Ishiagu, Ebonyi State. *Journal of Geology and Geosciences*. 4(4);2329-6755

8. Sam, A. K., Abbas, N. (2001). Assessment of radioactivity and the associated hazards in local and imported cement types used in Sudan. *Radiation protector Dosinneting* 93:275-277

9. Sivakumar, S. Chandrasekaran, A., Ravisanka, R., Ravikumar, S., Jebakumar, J., Vijayagopal, P., Vijayalakshmi, I., Jose, M. (2014). Measurement of natural radioactivity, and evaluation of radiation hazards in coastal sediments of east coast of Tamilnadu using statistical approach. *Journal of Taibah University for Science* 8:375-384.

10. Taskin, H., Karavus, M., Ay, P., Topuzughi, A., Hindiroglu, S., Karaha, G. (2009). Radionuclide concentrations in soil and infetime cancer risk due to the gamma radioactivity in kirklareli, Turkey. *Journal of environmental radiation* 100:49-53.

11. Turhan, S., Grunduz, L. (2008). Determination of specific activity of ^{226}Ra, ^{232}TH and ^{40}K for assessment of radiation hazards from Turkish Pumice samples. *Journal of environmental radiation*. 101: 54-52.

12. UNSCEAR (United Nation Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation) (1988). Sources, effects and risks of writing radiation, Annex B, United Nations, New York.

13. UNSCEAR, (2000). United Nation Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation Volume (1).

14. USA-EPA (2002). United State of America – Environmental Protection Agency.