

**Paper: “Safety of Ionizing Radiation in Selected Conventional X-ray Diagnostic Centres in Calabar and Uyo metropolises, Nigeria”**

**Submitted: 12 April 2022**

**Accepted: 18 June 2022**

**Published: 30 June 2022**

Corresponding Author: Michael Promise Ogolodom

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n21p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n21p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Hyacienth Uche Chiegwu  
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Nigeria

Reviewer 2: Daniel B. Hier  
Missouri University of Science and Technology, USA

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

*ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!*

Reviewer Name: Dr. Hyacienth Uche Chiegwu	
University/Country: Nnamdi Azikiwe University	
Date Manuscript Received: 20 <sup>th</sup> April, 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 26 <sup>th</sup> April, 2022
Manuscript Title: <b>Environmental safety to ionizing radiation in selected conventional X-ray diagnostic centres in Calabar and Uyo metropolis, Nigeria</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 044/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No YES	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No YES	

## Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i>
	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>Title is okay</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Abstract	
<b>The pointed comments have to be addressed.</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The minor corrections have to be made</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The method section has to be made clearer</b>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>Minor calculation errors noted</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>Conclusion and summary okay</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>References Okay</b>	

**Overall Recommendation**(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Method section needs more clarity

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

Accept manuscript after the review comments are addressed.

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name: Daniel B Hier MD	
University/Country: Missouri University of Science and Technology, Rolla MO USA	
Date Manuscript Received: 6/6/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 6/07/2022
Manuscript Title: <b>Environmental safety to ionizing radiation in selected conventional X-ray diagnostic centres in Calabar and Uyo metropolis, Nigeria</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 49.04.2022	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>1. Since Uyo and Calabar are two different capital cities—the plural form of metropolises should be used in the title</i>	

2. <i>Would prefer simplifying title to Safety of Ionizing Radiation in Selected Conventional X-ray Diagnostic Centres in Calabar and Uyo metropolises, Nigeria</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>No comments</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Change FDA white payer to white paper (typo)</b></li> <li>2. <u>Data gotten</u> was averaged and recorded. Rewrite for clarity</li> <li>3. From the quote of (NCRP, 1993), it was assumed for this study that; for uniform whole body exposure to x-ray (Photon), the radiation weighting factor is 1 and the tissue weighting factor of all the organs adds up to 1, therefore, an absorbed dose of 1 milligray (mGy) equals an effective dose of 1milliSievert (mSv). Rewrite for clarity.</li> <li>4. <b>ICRP and NCRP—write out in full and use American spelling of Center since these are American institutions</b></li> </ol>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Please comment as to whether centre U4 was an outlier and required any remediation,</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Please comment on U4. Was it above standard? Was remediation needed. A few spelling errors and typos to fix. In general, well-written. Use American spelling for ICRP and NCRP and spell out in full.