



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_19983
Title of the Manuscript:	Activity concentration of 222Rn gas ,226Ra, 232Th and 40K in crops and soil taken fromSafwan Granges using active, passive and gamma spectroscopy techniques
Type of the Article	Original research papers

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The authors present original results in field of radioactivity study of crops and compare the results obtained by active, passive and gamma spectroscopy techniques. The paper is written well and meets all academic requirements. The results are presented logically based on the suitable measurements while strong correlations have been found between methods used. I have only several formal recommendations: 1- The correlation coefficient should better to be expressed in the text as $R=0.95$ instead of $R=95\%$; 2-The abbreviations should be explained when used firstly, e.g. NORM in Introduction part; 3-please check English, e.g. page 7: Table 3, presented ... the sentence is not clear; similarly Part 4.1: 4- The concentrations exist? not better existing? check first three sentences.	<u>Author's comments</u> 1- The correlation coefficients were written as required by the reviewer 2- The abbreviation explained in the text 3- English language checked again in the title of table 7 and section 4.1 4- corrected to existing
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		