SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Applied Science & Technology**
Manuscript Number:	**2013_BJAST_5723**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Monitoring of gross alpha around some industrial regions in Egypt**
Type of the Article	**Research Paper**

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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI 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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	The research work is good but need to be structured well grammatically.	
Minor REVISION comments	Author should carry out the corrections and re-write the conclusion very well to summarise the whole work , and state the implication(s) of the findings to the general public	
Optional/General comments	The author was not objective in the presentation of the results. No statistical tool was used to show whether the differences in values were significant or not. I could not find reference to other peoples' work (from any part of the world) in the discussion. Is it that no work has been done in this area? if no, what was their findings?. State whether your work agree or disagree with other peoples work.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer