



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
(i) The authors have not followed the Journal format or the suggested format. They are still keeping with the old one which seems to be that of a thesis. 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) No consistencies in notation throughout the text ²³⁸U, ⁴⁰K and not 40K, 226Ra, etc.. Bq/kg not Bq/Kg; Gy hr⁻¹ not Gyh-1 or Gy/hr; (iii) While quoting a work, authors should be brief by mentioned only the results range. Ideally, maximum of 4 lines on a quoted work. (iv) Sections 1.1; 1.2 and 1.3 should be part of the last paragraph under review and not separated items like in a thesis. -Calibration procedure(not provided) (v) Under Methods, give details on the following - Samples should not be sun dried (Refer to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Technical Report Series No 295 (1989) for sample preparation Protocol. - The study area is not a point as show in the text by only one attitude and one longitude rather than a range of each. (vi) Non Consistencies in the presentation of results - Space between number and unit. (e.g. Write 9 cm instead of 9cm) both in the text and in the tables. General comments: (i) Authors did not carried out all corrections although they claimed they did. (ii) Authors did not explained how the concentration were computed, rather this part has been left empty (see 3.0: measurement and analysis of results) (iii) In the text we have 3.0: methodology and later 3.0: measurement and analysis of results. Also 4.0: conclusion when 4.1 to 4.4 were previously mentioned. That is 4.1 - 4.2 - 4.3 - 4.4 - 4.0 (iv) In the introduction, many irrelevant reviews in that part of the work have been mentioned(e.g:Jone et al. (2008), Odusote et al. (2014), Meindingo and Agbalagba (2012) Umar et al which occupied almost 3 pages. These are much been a quoted works.	This format has now been followed. The inconsistencies have been corrected with the style of ²³⁸U, ⁴⁰K used throughout the revised work.. Also, the suggested format here (Bq/kg not Bq/Kg; Gy hr⁻¹ not Gyh-1 or Gy/hr; has been used. These sections have been removed. The calibration procedure has also been included. This has been corrected to room dried. The study area has been made a range of latitude and longitude. The suggested format (9 cm) has been adopted and used throughout the work. All the comments under general comments have been carried out. How concentrations were computed has been included. The inconsistencies noted under (iii) have been corrected. All the irrelevant have been removed.



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

(v) These irrelevant items can be removed so as to reduce the work to about 15 pages maximum. Authors are advised to spent time and go through all the suggested corrections and not to claim that something has been done, when it is not.	The work has been reduced to 14 pages..
---	--