

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_86590
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF BACKGROUND GAMMA RADIATION LEVEL IN SELECTED DUMP SITE OF NIGER DELTA, 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.journalacri.com/index.php/ACRI/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The article's proposal is good. Overall, the abstract is well done. The methodology is well organized, just needing some simple adjustments. But I couldn't read the manuscript in the Results and Discussion section. Even because there is nothing to read. The authors just presented the tables, figures and discussed their GOOD results in just 123 words (I counted). I reiterate, the results are good and relevant. But unfortunately, there is no way to accept a manuscript without the minimum of scientific arguments. Therefore, my suggestion is that authors take a time discussing their good results. A comparison of the values obtained with other authors is important, in addition to the comparison with the ICRP. If the authors accept my suggestion, the conclusion should be substantially improved. If the authors find it unfeasible, there is the possibility of submitting the study as a technical note. In this case, the criteria for evaluating the manuscript are different.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	There is not	
Optional/General comments	There is not	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	José Marques Lopes
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal da Bahia, Brazil