



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	2015_PSIJ_16603
Title of the Manuscript:	Design of a Novel Shield of Nuclear Medicine with New Alloy
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>1-What about the thickness of the shield used in this study and reduce the photon dose in table 1?.</p> <p>2-What about the HVL for this shield at the used energy 662 keV?</p> <p>3- Comparison should be done between the suggested shield and traditional one as lead. What about (m) in line 140?</p> <p>What about the bulk density of this shield?</p> <p>Ethical issue:</p> <p>The paper contains a design of new gamma shield which may be important for different radiation applications.</p>	<p>1- 2 mm thickness that is mentioned in method and is added in results</p> <p>2- Radiation intensities after passing from shield using MCNP modeling was $5.172 \times 10^{-4} \pm 0.0049$ while without shield was $4.860 \times 10^{-1} \pm 0.0001$ as seen the shield reduces the received dose by a thousand times</p> <p>3- This alloy with 2mm thickness is equivalent with 20mm lead shield that is added in results.</p> <p>4- About (m) in line 140 : the correct word was them not (the m)</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		