



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_51908
Title of the Manuscript:	RADIATION ORGAN DOSES AND EXCESS LIFETIME CANCER RISK DUE TO EXPOSURE TO GAMMA RADIATION AROUND CEMENT PRODUCTION INDUSTRIES IN NIGERIA
Type of the 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>)

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	Main part of manuscript concerned the external irradiation is quite acceptable and interesting. Lack of details about calculation of effective dose rate for "examined" organs and tissues according digestive model (Fig.1and Fig2) in <i>Methods</i> . It is need to be explained why conversation factors F in Eq. 5 are similar for two geographic regions with different sources of digested nuclides . What nuclides were taken in calculation for reflecting geological specificity both regions (Potassium, Calcium,.. ?). How the huge (around 10-folds) difference between Figs 1 and 2 for both testis and ovarian can be formed according literally given Eq.5. These questions is incompatible with tittle of manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments	There are many errors in description special terms like multiplication sign, power, superscripts, subscript and so on.	
Optional/General comments	The presented data are valuable in context of future comprehensive generalization and summary for world health problems. But my private opinion about last phrase of Conclusion "Constant monitoring of these areas and other environmental media of the area is necessary " is: too much.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Aleksei N. Shoutko</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Russia</i>