



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Physical Science International Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_33973
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Electromagnetic Fields from Power Lines in Irrua, Edo State, 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Recommended improvements and changes: Page 1, line 6, Abstract: "alot of" to "a lot of", Page 1, line 11, and Page 5, line 180: "330kv" to "330 kV", Page 1, line 31: "...systems also have its disadvantages..." to "...systems also have their disadvantages..." Page 2, line 90: why is not used SI system of physical units?, "Gauss" is old unit in CGS system, moreover, not for H, but for B, Page 3, Tab. 1: why do you present Tab. 1 for "ICNIRP" and "European Union", when the presented limits are identical? Or is it any mistake there? Pages 3 and 4: I recommend to write variables in italics, not only inside numbered equations, where it is O.K., but also in the text, see e.g. <i>c</i>, <i>E</i>, <i>h</i>, <i>f</i>, etc., Page 5, Tab. 2: "Distance (M)" to "Distance (m)", Page 6, line 195: "Tab. 2 show..." to "Tab. 2 shows...", "...Fig.1 show..." to "...Fig. 1 shows...", Page 6, line 214: "300KV" to "300 kV", Page 7, line 221: "results shows" to "results show" Pages 7 and 8, References: some references are not completely presented, e.g. with missing pages, please check all of them and correct. Throughout the paper: - it is rather unusual to mark chapters by 1.0, 2.0, etc. (I would use 1., 2., etc.), but maybe, it is given by a format of the journal,</p>	<p>All these corrections are noted. We will comply accordingly were possible and applicable.</p> <p>All these corrections are noted. We will comply accordingly were possible and applicable.</p> <p>No sir, there is no mistake, just that the two bodies have the same limits.</p> <p>All these corrections are noted. We will comply accordingly were possible and applicable.</p> <p>All these corrections are noted. We will comply accordingly were possible and applicable.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- use spaces between numerical values and physical units, e.g. not "11000km", but "11000 km", or not "50Hz", but "50 Hz", etc.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I consider this paper as a review article pointing out on some problems with possible effects of high power lines on inhabitants living near of them, and comparing results of measurements to international standards. Besides, recommendations are also provided for both people and energy companies. The paper evokes me rather a technical report of some practical measurements done in a concrete area.	We appreciate this team of reviewer(s) for their constructive criticism. We also appreciate the management of this reputable journal for their interest in our research.