Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Physical Science International Journal**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_PSIJ_85548**
Title of the Manuscript:	**RADIONUCLIDE TRANSFER RATIO FROM SOIL TO CROPS IN SELECTED FERTILIZED FARMS AND ESTIMATION OF ITS HEALTH RISK IN RIVERS STATE OF 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.journalpsij.com/index.php/PSIJ/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	**Even though it is a routine measurement without any innovation, the authors present some useful experimental data.** **The presentation is of poor quality both in its crispness and English.** **If the Editors agree I can help in rewriting the whole manuscript in a presentable form without any modification of the data presented.**	
Minor REVISION comments	Abstract should be rewritten avoiding any numbers. Introduction is too long. Reference to health related aspects ccan be made as minimal as possible. Introduction should be rewritten particularly with reference to English and grammar. References {9] comes first in the manuscript. It should be numbered [1] and follow the order. There is no uniformity in citing the references. The numbers cited in the text have no such numbers. If there is a format for reference citation and reference listing at the end , it should be followed . If the editors' allow the reviewer is ready to rewrite the whole manuscript in a presentable form. The data should be presented in the most recent way of presentation particularly with reference to errors in the data..	
Optional/General comments		

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:	**K. Venkataramaniah**
Department, University & Country	**Sri Sathya Sai Institute of Higher Learning, India**