

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Physical and Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOPACS_83221
Title of the Manuscript:	Radiological Health Risk from Gamma Radiation of Coastal Communities in Okrika Local Government Area of Rivers State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalajopacs.com/index.php/AJOPACS/editorial-policy>)

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>I have keenly gone through the article. My observations and comments are as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Authors have provided some new results on the selected study area which is an appreciable effort.2. The level of language competency and scientific drafting was low. However, I myself have DELETED, ADDED and REPHRASED some of the sentences to appreciate the authors. Especially formatting of mathematical equations should be improved.3. This type of survey study is generally not a Full Length Article. However, it may be treated as a Short Communication or a Survey.4. Introduction is fully PLAGIARISED. Authors have copied the same lines from the references cited in the manuscript. It cannot be tolerated worldwide, so please rephrase them and write only the most relevant lines to your work. I have mentioned in my comments on the manuscript.5. Authors have selected 9 places while they provided contour maps of only 7 as contour maps of Ibuluya/Dikibo and Abam are missing.6. The quality of the Figures must be improved. For example, there are no units available on the y-axis of Figures 8, 9, 10, 11.7. NUSCEAR must be written carefully correctly in the whole manuscript. At many places it written wrongly.8. All the data provided by the author(s) must be genuine. And the genuineness is solely at the authors end. We can just trust that the data is original and genuine.9. In Results and Discussions section: Ranges of the selected Quantities are mentioned wrongly. They are not matching with the relevant figured provided. I have mentioned these mistakes in the comments on the manuscript. This mistake is FATAL and cannot be tolerated otherwise the article must be REJECTED.10. In Excess Life Cancer Risk section of Results and Discussion: Authors showed that the values of all communities and the overall mean are higher than the world average of 0.29×10^{-3}. This result indicates that the background ionization radiation has been influenced due to man-man activities particularly oil activities carried out within the study areas. Also, the chances of developing cancer health related issue in this area are SIGNIFICANT. And yet the authors claim their selected study are to be hazard-free. Can it be justified please?11. Equation 1 and Equation 2 are same. Strange!12. Please provide the sensitivity of the radiation survey meter used in this research.13. References must be written according to the Journal's format.14. Consequent upon the above observations, recommendations and suggestions, my opinion is that this manuscript should be accepted for publication after a SERIOUS MAJOR REVISION.	Done
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	Authors must be appreciated and encouraged for this type of beneficial study but also encouraged to write the manuscript in QUALITY presentation style.	
---------------------------	---	--

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	Agreed