



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_46939
Title of the Manuscript:	Radiation Absorbed Dose Rates from Selected Mobile Phone Base Stations in Ibadan, Oyo 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>)

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	Language: Some words and sentences should be changed in order to clarify the meaning.	
Minor REVISION comments	Suggested alterations (suggested words are in brackets written in red) : Line 26: Humans in the modern ... Line 55: ... which is extremely ... Line 72: ...the populace (citizens, inhabitants) have expressed ... Line 140: slight (negligible) – this is optional Line 153: However, considering (consideration for) the long term health effects ... Line 157: in conformity (in agreement with the fact) that the strength ... Line 194: ... there is no reason to entertain (presume, assume, suppose) that ... Line 195: to human (people, public). Line 195: There are need for human to operate devices (The devices should be operated) in ... Line 204: ... the values reported are not high ... Line 205: ... heating effects to (on) people ... Line 209: ... irrespective of (to) the location ... Lines 209 and 210: The authors should change this sentence in order to clarify the meaning. Line 210: This is in conformity (in agreement with the fact) that the ... Line 224: populace (citizens, inhabitants, people) from the study area ...	Thanks for your suggestions. We have made the corrections as suggested.
Optional/General comments	The subject of the paper is very interesting and up to date. Measuring the radiation dose from mobile phone base stations could provide very significant insight to the effects that such stations could have on citizens living near them. Investigations that are undertaken in this paper (which are very thorough) open a wide topic of health issues that are connected to the irradiation of all kinds. Therefore, a suggestion to the authors is that in future, it would be very important and widely significant to monitor the health of people living nearby investigated base stations. Though it is a long term project (probably 5-10 years), obtained results should provide very conclusive facts regarding the influence of irradiation on the human health. The title and the abstract are coherent and appropriate to the content of the paper, and the paper as a whole is well structured and clear. In my opinion, the paper should be published in its present form, with minor editing of language.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	