



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_PSIJ_8726
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF ACTIVITY CONCENTRATIONS OF RADIONUCLIDE WITH DEPTH IN WASTELAND SOILS IN ABEOKUTA, SOUTHWEST 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:

(<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	(i) Kindly present your work following the pre-set format of the Journal (PSIJ), or referred to the following standard format if not: Title 1) Introduction 2) Materials and Methods 2.1) Sampling and Sample Preparation 2.2) Instrumentation and Evaluation of Activity Concentration 3) Results and Discussion 4) Conclusion and Recommendations Acknowledgement Reference (ii) Not History is required (delete from line 120 to 147). (iii) Under Instrumentation give details on the following - Model and Type of the detector - Location of the Laboratory used for the analysis - Calibration procedure (iv) Under Methods, give details on the following - Sampling - Sample preparation such as the size of the sieve used - Did the samples sealed, if yes how and	This format has been followed. This section has been deleted. Details of these have been supplied. See section 4.1. Details have been given. See section 3.2 – “Sample Collection”



SDI Review Form 1.6

	for how long - Samples should not be sun dried (Refer to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Technical Report Series No 295 (1989) for sample preparation Protocol. (v) Table 1 Data are not well presented for Longitude and Latitude (refer to line 154 in the text. e.g. 7⁰39'39''N and 3⁰20'54''E and not 7,09265) (vi) Non Consistencies in the presentation of results - Write 391.82 ±14.04 Bq/kg instead of 391.824 ± 14.04424 Bq/Kg (keep two(or same) decimal number always) . - Space between number and unit.(e.g. write 9 cm instead of 9cm) both in the text and in the tables. (vii) Computing average based on depths for all locations is not advisable as locations are quite different (see lines 227 – 231) (viii) Figures Figures 1, 5 and 9 can be made one. Similar for 2,6 and 10; 3, 7 and 11 as well as 4, 8, and 12. (ix) Reference quoted in the text should have a year of publication (see lines 236, 354 for UNSCEAR) (x) In the Reference always write ²³⁸U or U-238, ²²⁶Ra or Ra-226, ²³²Th or Th-232, ⁴⁰K or K-40 instead of 238U, 226Ra,	The laboratory where the samples were analysed instated that the samples must be sundried. These have been corrected as suggested. These have also been corrected as suggested. All these have been corrected. These have been removed. The graphs have been merged as suggested, they are now fugues 2 – 5 The year of publication has been included. (year 2000) The format suggested has been followed.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	232Th and 40K. (xi) Rn-226(tables) and Th-238(line 191)/Th-234(line 14, 198, 200, tables, etc..) are not progenies of U-238 and Th-232. How the authors did came about them? (xii) No year of publication and editions for references on lines 448 and 450 (xiii) Incorrect Title for reference in line 451	The inconsistencies have been removed. The information has been provided. The title has been provided.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		