



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 from Safwan 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	1- I strongly recommend that the text must be read and re-written by native English speaker before send to the reviewers. The used grammar makes difficult to follow the text. Many sentences are meaningless. 2- The study area section is not sufficient to understand the soil geological formation. The geological formation is very important to interpret the source of radiation explosion to the area. 3- The active technique is not well explained. 4- Many used energies for determining the isotopes are very closed to each other. Since the NaI detector resolution is relatively low it is better to give the used spectrum to clearly understand how the calculation of the radioactivity concentrations are made. 5- The units must be used in the same representations. e.g. Bq/Kg, Bq/kg, etc... 6- The data must be given in same format. e.g. instead of 46 ± 6.2 46.0 ± 6.2, etc... 7- According to conclusion many correlations should not be given. e.g. figure 3 through 8. What is the scientific sound of those figures? As I understand that the scientific mean of those figure are out of the aim of the manuscript or it seems likely that.	1- The text has been read by English expert and corrected as required 2- The geological information about the study area has been added to the section with references. 3- The active technique has been rewritten to make it clear and the figure has been changed. 4- NaI we used has good resolution within 47 keV and we used average value for peak, the spectrum added to the text 5- Units corrected in tables and text 6- Date formatted symmetrically 7- The scientific sound of these figure are; A) If one find correlation, then it will be easy to estimate the value of radionuclide concentration and reduced the parameters special in the modelling work. B) If there is no correlation, then the distribution of radionuclide material is random and this makes modelling much harder.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		