



## Assessment of radionuclide distribution and associated radiological hazards of soils in Mayo-Belwa, Adamawa state

I. Catherine<sup>a</sup>, O. C. Meludu<sup>a</sup>, O. P. Idowu<sup>b</sup>, Dolapo S. Olaniyan<sup>b,\*</sup>, Kolawole E. Adesina<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Physics, Modibbo Adama University Yola, Nigeria.

<sup>b</sup>Department of Physics, Federal University Oye-Ekiti, Nigeria.

<sup>c</sup>School of Health Sciences, Purdue University, West-Lafayette, Indiana, U.S.A.

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received: 02 September 2023

Received in revised form: 22 October 2023

Accepted: 25 October 2023

Available online: 26 November 2023

**Keywords:** Radioactivity, Gamma spectroscopy, Soil, Hazard indices

DOI:10.61298/rans.2023.1.2.25

### ABSTRACT

Mayo-Belwa Local Government Area has been reported to have deposits of Uranium; hence this study was carried out to measure radionuclide activities in Mayo-Belwa soils and to monitor their potential impact on human health. Soils from a depth of 10 cm were collected from each location, using CANBERA NaI (TI) detector, the activity concentration of radionuclides of 10 soil samples was measured. The radionuclide concentration ranged between 72.7069 - 116.8504  $Bq.kg^{-1}$  for  $^{238}U$  (measured by  $^{226}Ra$  activity), 148.9168 - 981.4994  $Bq.kg^{-1}$  for  $^{40}K$  and 22.3332 - 108.5203  $Bq.kg^{-1}$  for  $^{232}Th$ . The gamma absorbed dose rate, annual effective dose rate, ranged between 61.3932-138.1076  $nGy.h^{-1}$ , 0.0830 - 0.211  $mSv.y^{-1}$  with mean values of  $95.1762 \pm 21.5257$  and  $0.1216 \pm 0.0359$  respectively. The values obtained were compared with the reported data from UNSCEAR, 2000 and ICRP 2005. The excess lifetime cancer risk ranged between 0.00026-0.00061 with an average value of  $8.44 \times 10^{-4}$ . The gamma, internal and external hazard indices ranged between 0.4631-1.0975, 0.5969- 0.9978 and 0.3601-0.8087 respectively. However, dose rates recorded in all locations were above the 60  $nGy.h^{-1}$  recommended limits by UNSCEAR 2000. Furthermore, Ganglare had a gamma index above 1, implying a significant radiation hazard. Also, the average excess lifetime cancer risk (ELCR) of  $0.844 \times 10^{-3}$  was relatively high ( $t < 0.05$ ) and compared to the world average value of  $0.29 \times 10^{-3}$ . With the help of this study, we were able to establish the fundamental facts about the levels of radioactivity and related radiological dangers that exist in the soil of Mayo-Belwa Local Government.

© 2023 The Author(s). Production and Hosting by FLAYOO Publishing House LTD on Behalf of the Nigerian Society of Physical Sciences (NSPS). Peer review under the responsibility of NSPS. This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license. Further distribution of this work must maintain attribution to the author(s) and the published article's title, journal citation, and DOI.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Over the years, the accumulation of radioactivity from radionuclides like  $^{238}U$ ,  $^{232}Th$ , and  $^{40}K$  as well as the decay by products

found in soils and rocks have created a severe environmental risk to people as well as a number of animal species living in their natural habitats [1]. The most vulnerable are the offspring of the uranium and thorium series, specifically  $^{226}Ra$ ,  $^{222}Rn$ ,  $^{218}Po$ ,  $^{214}Pb$ ,  $^{214}Po$ , and  $^{228}Ra$ ,  $^{220}Rn$ ,  $^{216}Po$ ,  $^{212}Pb$ ,  $^{212}Bi$ , and  $^{212}Po$  respectively. According to studies, just 4% of the total radiation that the

\*Corresponding author: Tel.: +234-903-497-690

e-mail: olaniyansuaib@gmail.com (Dolapo S. Olaniyan)

earth's surface receives comes from artificial sources, while the majority—approximately 96%—comes from natural sources [2]. The weathering of granitic stones is one example of a terrestrial source of naturally occurring radionuclides that exhibit continuous activity [3–5]. As a result, radionuclides that are from rocks are naturally occurring [6]. The presence of certain accessory minerals that contain radionuclides, such as monazite, apatite, zircon, allanite, mica, sphene and feldspars, are what causes the high radiation levels [7–10] including oxides of manganese and hydroxide compounds, as well as colloidal iron [11–14]. Anthropogenic activities like nuclear weapon testing on a scheduled basis and unintentional emission from nuclear power facilities that emit radioactive substances into the environment are the main sources of artificial radioactivity. Additionally, it has been noted that too much phosphate fertilizer application in agricultural soils increases the amount of artificial radioactivity in the soil [15].

In addition, it has also been noted that industrial operations such as heavy metal mining, oil extraction, processing, and transport activities have increased functional concentration [16, 17]. These activities are prevalent within the study area. Hence, the need for routine assessment. Soils have been identified as potential repository for radionuclides and other types of contaminants [6]. Human health is at risk as a result of radioactive accumulation of radionuclide contaminants in terrestrial marine and marine settings. The bioavailability, uptake and transfer of these radionuclides in soils and various food chains are regulated by environmental factors including soil potential for redox clay-sized soil fraction, degree of weathering, number of contaminants, organic matter content, pH, temperature fluxes and precipitation [18, 19]. The physical and chemical properties of the ecosystem control these processes. However, the process by which radionuclides enter biological systems is comparable to how same systems absorb nutrients from food, water and soil [19]. Due to their elevated mobility and high solubility, radionuclides constitute an exposure concern when they are present in sediments [3, 4, 20, 21].

As an interface connecting other elements of the physical environment such as air and water soils retain radionuclides [22]. Through consumption, injection, and inhalation, radionuclides found in soil and sediments may be transferred to living things, including plants, animals and other environmental elements, where they can accumulate to dangerous amounts in the body [13, 23]. The production of gamma radiations from radioactive decay of the  $^{238}\text{U}$  and  $^{232}\text{Th}$  series, which includes  $^{40}\text{K}$ , is a risk factor that can endanger the environment externally or internally through radon inhalation and ingestion by people and other living things [24–26]. Ionizing radiation from radioisotopes has been blamed for various chronic diseases' high rates such as lung and kidney malignancies, acute leucopenia and anemia [27]. In addition, DNA damage from ionizing radiation can cause mutation [28]. Recently, studies on natural radionuclide origin and behavior [6, 29, 30], spatial distribution of soil, sediments, water and plants, [31–34], food crops [35] and soil effects of phosphorus ores and fertilizers [1, 36] have dominated many scientific fora. Reports of radionuclide enrichment in some sea foods and snails also exist [32, 37, 38]. Radioactive contaminants in soils have been identified and possible remediation strategies such as stabilization and chemical extraction techniques have been sug-

gested. Research show that beach sediments and sands often used in building houses contain certain levels of naturally occurring radioactive materials resulting from primordial radionuclide of cosmic origin [39–41].

A study conducted by Ref. [42] in Niger state on determination of radiological hazard indices from surface soil to individuals in Angwan kawo gold mining site indicated that radioactivity and absorbed doses were below the ICRP recommended public dose limit of  $1\text{ mSv}\cdot\text{y}^{-1}$ . Another study conducted by Ref. [43] shows that the radiological hazards from radionuclide concentration obtained in Northwestern Nigeria (Zamfara State) is greater than the admissible recommended limits and the world average. Mining activities have emerged as a prominent contributor to radiation exposure from naturally occurring radioactive materials (NORMs). Unfortunately, this has resulted in public exposure doses that are contrary to accepted radiation protection standards, thereby lacking justification [44]. Inadequate ventilation in mining operations could result in radiation levels surpassing established limits, leading to significantly higher incidence of lung cancer among both mining workers and the general public [45].

Measured concentration of radionuclides from mining sites either exceed or fall below the established baseline limits. This discrepancy is attributed to the varying mineral content and distinct geology found in different locations, resulting in natural radioactivity levels that differ from one place to another [46–48].

It is crucial to assess the public dose potentially resulting from radioactivity generated by mining activities. This estimation is essential to determine the probability of public exposure and to ensure public confidence that this exposure remains below the recommended dose limit of  $1\text{ mSv}\cdot\text{y}^{-1}$ , as established by reputable organizations [44]. Therefore, this study was conducted in Mayo-Belwa to assess the levels of radionuclide activities and the associated radiological risk, This is necessary because sand and laterites obtained from these areas site is utilized as a construction material for residential, educational and commercial buildings.

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 2.1. STUDY AREA

Mayo-Belwa is a Local Government Area of Adamawa State in Nigeria. It has a total land area of  $1.768\text{ km}^2$  and located between  $8^{\circ}3'N - 9^{\circ}10'N$  and  $11^{\circ}50'E - 12^{\circ}10'E$  with an estimated population of about 204200 people. It is located between Jada and Demsa local government areas of the state and shares boundary with Taraba State as shown in Figure 1. The majority of residents in Mayo-Belwa belong to the Chamba ethnic group and are active farmers. However, the presence of abundant natural resources has led to an increase in illegal mining activities, as many young people seek alternative sources of income.

### 2.2. SAMPLING COLLECTION AND PREPARATION

The Geiger Muller system was used to determine the count rate at every sample location considered in this study. The Garmin Etrex 20 Handheld Global Positioning System was used to determine the coordinate of each location where samples were collected. Background radiation in counts per minute was recorded for 20 locations. Sample locations were selected randomly from the table of background radiation to include the location with



detector is enclosed in a 6 cm lead shield with cadmium and copper sheets. This arrangement is aimed at minimizing the effects of background and scattered radiation. Each soil sample was measured for 29000 seconds. The peak area of each energy in the spectrum was used to compute the activity concentrations in each sample using the following equation:

$$C(Bq.kg^{-1}) = C_n/C_{fk} \quad (1)$$

where  $C$  denote activity concentration of the radionuclides in the sample given in  $Bq.kg^{-1}$ ,  $C_n$  represents count rate (counts per second) and  $C_{fk}$  denotes  $C$ =calibration factor of the detecting system.

$$Count\ per\ second\ (cps) = Net\ Count/Live\ Count \quad (2)$$

### 2.4. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Baseline levels of metals in Mayo – Belwa soil samples were determined using Microsoft Excel version 12 (2007) for Windows. Descriptive statistics such as range, mean, and standard deviation were then calculated for the radionuclide levels in the soil samples.

## 3. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

### 3.1. GAMMA ABSORBED DOSE RATE

The contribution of the natural radionuclides to the absorbed dose rate in air (D) depends on the concentration of the radionuclides in the soil. The dose can be calculated using absorbed dose rate conversion factors depending on the radionuclides in the soil. The conversion factors described by Ref. [54] were adopted and the gamma absorbed dose rates were calculated using the following formula:

$$D(nGy.h^{-1}) = 0.462A_U + 0.604A_{Th} + 0.0417A_K, \quad (3)$$

where D is the dose rate at 1m above the ground and  $A_U$ ,  $A_{Th}$ , and  $A_K$  are the activity concentrations ( $Bq.kg^{-1}$ ) of  $^{238}U$ ,  $^{232}Th$ , and  $^{40}K$ , respectively, in the soil sample according to Ref. [55].

### 3.2. ANNUAL EFFECTIVE DOSE RATE

The gamma absorbed doses rate in  $nGy.h^{-1}$  were converted to annual effective dose in  $\mu Sv.y^{-1}$ , as proposed by Goran *et al.* [53]. The annual effective dose rate (AEDR) was calculated using the following equation:

$$AEDR(\mu Sv.y^{-1}) = D(nGy.h^{-1}) \times 8760(h.y^{-1}) \times 0.2 \times 0.7(Sv.Gy^{-1}) \times 10^{-3}, \quad (4)$$

where D is the absorbed dose rate in air ( $nGy.h^{-1}$ ), 0.7 is the dose conversion factor ( $Sv.Gy^{-1}$ ), 0.2 is the outdoor occupancy factor, and 8760 is the time conversion factor ( $h.y^{-1}$ ) according to Ref. [55].

### 3.3. INTERNAL HAZARD INDEX

The internal radiation index is the internal exposure due to  $^{222}Rn$  and its short lived decay products. This was calculated using equation 5 and must be less than or equal to unity according to Refs. [49–52].

$$H_{in} = \frac{A_{Ra}}{185} + \frac{A_{Th}}{259} + \frac{A_K}{4810} \leq 1. \quad (5)$$

### 3.4. GAMMA INDEX ( $I_\gamma$ )

This was adopted to check the possibility of application of building materials. The gamma index is calculated using the following formula according to Refs. [53].

$$I_\gamma = \frac{A(Ra)}{300} + \frac{A(Th)}{200} + \frac{A(K)}{3000} \leq 1. \quad (6)$$

### 3.5. EXTERNAL HAZARD INDEX

External hazard index is applied to reflect external exposure and it presents a single index that gives the gamma yield from different combinations of  $^{226}Ra$ ,  $^{232}Th$  and  $^{40}K$  in the sample. It is defined by the following equation according to Refs. [43, 49, 50, 52] as:

$$H_{ex} = \frac{A(Ra)}{370} + \frac{A(Th)}{259} + \frac{A(K)}{4810} \leq 1. \quad (7)$$

### 3.6. EXCESSIVE LIFETIME CANCER RISKS

This is the probability of developing cancer over a lifetime at a given exposure level. This was presented as a value representing the number of cancers expected in a given number of people on exposure to carcinogen at a given dose. ELCR was estimated using the equation

$$ELCR = AEDE \times DL \times RF \times 10^{-3}, \quad (8)$$

where AEDE is the annual effective dose equivalent, DL is the average duration of life (estimated 70) and RF the Risk factor ( $Sv$ ) is 0.05 for public according to Ref. [51].

## 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 4.1. BACKGROUND RADIATION

Figure 2 shows Geiger Muller background radiation of twenty (20) locations in Mayo-Belwa Local Government Area, Adamawa State. The radiation counts per minute ranged between 19 cpm to 48 cpm. Furthermore, the radiation counts were lower than 100 cpm warning radiation count.

### 4.2. ACTIVITY CONCENTRATION

According to results from radionuclide examination in Table 1, Figure 3 and Figure 4, the highest Radium activity  $116.8504 Bq.kg^{-1}$  was reported in SP1 while the lowest activity  $68.6322 Bq.kg^{-1}$  was reported in SP4 Also, the average radium activity value exceeded world average value recommended by Ref. [54]. The highest potassium activity  $981.4994 Bq.kg^{-1}$  was reported in SP3 while the least activity  $148.9168 Bq.kg^{-1}$  was reported in SP2 as seen in Table 1 and Figure 5. Four locations (SP2, SP9, SP8, and SP4) had potassium activity levels lower than world average value  $370 Bq.kg^{-1}$  while other locations had potassium activity levels higher than world average value by Ref. [54]. Hence, residents in these locations are prone to potassium poisoning. The highest value of thorium activity  $108.5203 Bq.kg^{-1}$  was reported in SP10 while the lowest activity  $22.3332 Bq.kg^{-1}$  was reported in SP9. Two locations (SP9 and SP3) had  $^{232}Th$  activities lower than world average value  $40 Bq.kg^{-1}$  as stipulated in Ref. [54] and shown in Figure 6. The mean value of Radium activity, Potassium activity in this study were higher value than those from previous studies presented in Table 2 this could be attributed to uneven distribution of radionuclide in the soil. The radionuclide concentration contour maps of the study area Figures

**Table 1.** <sup>226</sup>Ra, <sup>40</sup>K, <sup>232</sup>Th activity concentration of samples

| Location | <sup>226</sup> Ra (Bq.kg <sup>-1</sup> ) | <sup>40</sup> K (Bq.kg <sup>-1</sup> ) | <sup>232</sup> Th (Bq.kg <sup>-1</sup> ) |
|----------|--|--|--|
| SP1      | 116.8504 ± 6.5916                        | 739.8649 ± 1.1369                      | 41.2849 ± 2.9489                         |
| SP2      | 72.7069 ± 6.9112                         | 148.9168 ± 0.9384                      | 57.3663 ± 8.4143                         |
| SP3      | 73.1464 ± 6.3119                         | 981.4994 ± 1.2709                      | 38.0214 ± 8.4143                         |
| SP4      | 68.6322 ± 6.9511                         | 304.6976 ± 1.3460                      | 58.7818 ± 6.6449                         |
| SP5      | 101.6299 ± 7.9498                        | 621.9970 ± 1.4157                      | 54.4567 ± 7.5492                         |
| SP6      | 91.2832 ± 6.7913                         | 675.9974 ± 0.7293                      | 54.4567 ± 5.3867                         |
| SP7      | 89.1259 ± 6.8313                         | 612.7735 ± 1.2387                      | 56.3440 ± 8.9254                         |
| SP8      | 76.9016 ± 6.5117                         | 209.4595 ± 0.1604                      | 66.4097 ± 4.6396                         |
| SP9      | 87.6478 ± 8.5091                         | 177.7134 ± 1.0296                      | 22.3332 ± 3.3028                         |
| SP10     | 69.9505 ± 6.1122                         | 965.0901 ± 1.1476                      | 108.5203 ± 8.6108                        |
| Mean     | 84.7874 ± 15.6548                        | 543.8010 ± 315.3061                    | 55.7975 ± 22.4945                        |

**Table 2.** Comparison of results of present study with similar work

| References                  | Country       | <sup>226</sup> Ra (Bq.kg <sup>-1</sup> ) | <sup>232</sup> Th (Bq.kg <sup>-1</sup> ) | <sup>40</sup> K (Bq.kg <sup>-1</sup> ) | ELCR    | D nGyh <sup>-1</sup> | AEDR mSvy <sup>-1</sup> |
|-----------------------------|---------------|--|--|--|---------|----------------------|-------------------------|
| Present Study               | Nigeria       | 84.79 ± 15.66                            | 55.80 ± 22.50                            | 543.80 ± 315.31                        | 0.0004  | 95.18 ± 21.53        | 0.12 ± 0.04             |
| Esirole <i>et al.</i> [42]  | Nigeria       | 53.94 ± 3.02                             | 48.61 ± 2.06                             | 314 ± 23.03                            | *       | 53.94 ± 2.84         | *                       |
| Ademola <i>et al.</i> [56]  | Nigeria       | 55.3 ± 1.2                               | 26.4 ± 2.7                               | 505.1 ± 7.1                            | *       | 66.3 ± 4.1           | 0.081 ± 5.0             |
| Akpanowo <i>et al.</i> [43] | Nigeria       | 41.60 ± 11.06                            | 151.15 ± 21.09                           | 380.34 ± 116.41                        | 0.00062 | 145 ± 26             | *                       |
| Adewoyin <i>et al.</i> [57] | Nigeria       | 25.49 ± 1.05                             | 64.89 ± 1.50                             | 181.38 ± 2.22                          | *       | 61.68                | *                       |
| Durusoy and Yildirim [55]   | Turkey        | 24.5                                     | 51.8                                     | 344.9                                  | *       | 56.9                 | 0.069                   |
| UNSCEAR [54]                | World Average | 35                                       | 30                                       | 420                                    | 0.00029 | 60                   | 0.07                    |

\*: Not included in the study

**Table 3.** Absorbed dose rate, annual effective dose rate, excess lifetime cancer risk, gamma index, internal and external hazard indices from the different locations. All values were obtained using formulas as previously stated.s

| Locations  | D (nGyh) <sup>-1</sup> | AEDR (mSvy) <sup>-1</sup> | ELCR            | H <sub>in</sub> | H <sub>ex</sub> | I <sub>γ</sub>  |
|------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Tola       | 109.7316               | 0.1346                    | 0.00047         | 0.9448          | 0.6290          | 0.8430          |
| Gang Fada  | 74.4497                | 0.0913                    | 0.00047         | 0.6455          | 0.4489          | 0.5788          |
| Balgare    | 94.6871                | 0.1161                    | 0.00042         | 0.7462          | 0.5485          | 0.7611          |
| Tola Jabu  | 79.9182                | 0.0980                    | 0.00035         | 0.8872          | 0.4758          | 0.6242          |
| Gajere     | 105.0855               | 0.1289                    | 0.00046         | 0.8267          | 0.6126          | 0.8162          |
| Gongoshi   | 103.2534               | 0.1266                    | 0.00045         | 0.8442          | 0.5975          | 0.8019          |
| Binyiri    | 100.7610               | 0.1235                    | 0.00044         | 0.8267          | 0.5858          | 0.7830          |
| Mayo Dembi | 84.3745                | 0.1035                    | 0.00037         | 0.7156          | 0.5078          | 0.6582          |
| Gashifa    | 61.3932                | 0.0830                    | 0.00026         | 0.5969          | 0.3601          | 0.4631          |
| Ganglare   | 138.1076               | 0.2112                    | 0.00062         | 0.9978          | 0.8087          | 1.0975          |
| Mean       | 95.1762 ± 21.5257      | 0.1216 ± 0.0359           | 0.0004 ± 0.0001 | 0.8032 ± 0.1274 | 0.5575 ± 0.1219 | 0.7427 ± 0.1742 |

4, 5 and 6 show areas with highest activities in red colour, yellow colour represent areas with higher activity while areas with the lowest activities are in green colour.

**4.3. RADIOLOGICAL RISK ASSESSMENT PARAMETERS**

The absorbed dose rate in the soil samples in the area of study presented in Table 3 varied from 61.3932 nGyh<sup>-1</sup> (S9) to 138.1076 nGyh<sup>-1</sup> (S10) with an average value of 95.1762 nGyh<sup>-1</sup>. The absorbed dose was slightly higher than Ref. [54] population weighted average value of 60 nGyh<sup>-1</sup>. The annual effective dose rate in Table 3 was estimated to quantify the ra-

diological risk of radionuclides in soil to the inhabitants and the results ranged between 0.0830 and 0.2112 mSvy<sup>-1</sup> with an average value of 0.1216 mSvy<sup>-1</sup>. The average value of the AEDR was observed to be higher than the world recommended safe limit of 0.07mSvy<sup>-1</sup> by an approximate factor of 2. The result of AEDR in the present study was much greater than values reported by in Ref. [56] (Table 2). The gamma index, internal and external hazard indices satisfied the criterion of unity in all locations except SP10 which recorded a gamma index of 1.0975 (Table 3) but the total average were below the values reported by Refs. [49–52] criterion corresponding to ≤. The Excess lifetime cancer risk ob-

tained ranged between 0.00026 and 0.00047 with average value of  $0.0004 \pm 0.0001$ . This value was greater than Ref. [54] world average value of 0.00029 (Table 2).

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

The maximum and minimum concentrations of radionuclides reported in this study varied for the three examined radionuclides across different locations within Mayo-Belwa local government area, Adamawa State. For each examined radionuclide, locations with the highest and lowest activity concentrations also had the highest and least counts per second (cps) respectively. The radium equivalent of the locations was lower than the recommended value which means their soil is suitable for agriculture and construction. Though the internal, external and most gamma indices were below the recommended value the gamma index of SP10 was above unity and this requires further investigation or remediation. The absorbed dose rate, annual effective dose rate and excess lifetime cancer risk were above the Ref. [54] recommended world average suggesting higher radionuclide activity concentration. Hence, adequate in-situ monitoring facilities should be employed to confirm risk level and ensure safety of residents of SP10.

## References

- [1] F. O. Ugbede, O. N. N. Okoye, A. F. Akpolile & B. B. Oladele, "Baseline Radioactivity in the Soil of Evangel Take-Off Campus, Evangel University, Nigeria, and Its Associated Health Risks", *Chemistry Africa* **4** (2021) 703. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42250-021-00254-8>.
- [2] F. Chabaux, J. Riotte & O. Dequincey, "U–Th–Ra Fractionation During Weathering and River Transport", *Reviews in Mineralogy and Geochemistry* **52** (2003) 533. <http://doi.org/10.2113/0520533>.
- [3] Q. M. R. Nizam, M. A. Ginnah, M. M. Rahman, M. Kamal & M. I. Chowdhury, "Assessment of activity concentrations of radionuclides from upper-level sediment in Charfassion Island, Bhola, Bangladesh". *J Nucl Part Phys* **3** (2013) 36. <https://doi.org/10.5923/j.jnpp.20130303.02>
- [4] S. Issa, S. M. Alaseri & S. Arabia, "Determination of natural radioactivity and associated radiological risk in building materials used in Tabuk Area, Saudi Arabia". *Int J Adv Sci Technol* **82** (2015) 45. <https://doi.org/10.14257/IJAST.2015.82.05>.
- [5] S. Khuntong, C. Phaophang & W. Sudprasert, "Assessment of radionuclides and heavy metals in marine sediments along the Upper Gulf of Thailand", *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **611** (2015) 012023. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/611/1/012023>.
- [6] K. Szarłowicz, M. Stobinski, L. Hamerlik & P. Bitusik, "Origin and behavior of radionuclides in sediment core: a case study of the sediments collected from man-made reservoirs located in the past mining region in Central Slovakia", *Environ Sci Pollut Res* **26** (2019) 7115. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-019-04136-y>.
- [7] V. Kannan, M. P. Rajan, M. Iyengar & R. Ramesh, "Distribution of natural and anthropogenic radionuclides in soil and beach sand samples of Kalpakkam (India) using hyper pure germanium (HPGe) gamma ray spectrometry", *Appl. Radiat. Isot.* **57** (2002) 109. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0969-8043\(01\)00262-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0969-8043(01)00262-7).
- [8] R. C. Ramola, V. M. Choubey, P. Ganesh, G. S. Gusain, Z. Tloshva & A. Kies, "Radionuclides analysis in the soil of Kumaun Himalayas, India, using gamma ray spectrometry", *Curr. Sci.* **100** (2011) 906. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24076484>
- [9] M. A. Hannan, N. M. R. Nguyen, "Natural radioactivity and its gamma dose rate in mission (Texas) soils", *J Radioanal Nucl Chem* **295** (2013) 729. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10967-012-1840-9>
- [10] R. Sivakumar, "An assessment of natural radioactivity levels and radiation hazards in the soil of Coonoor, south India", *J. Environ Earth Sci.* **72** (2014) 5063. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtuci.2014.03.004>.
- [11] B. A. McKee, "U- and Th-series nuclides in estuarine environments. Elsevier BV" **12** (2008) 193. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1569-4860\(07\)00006-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1569-4860(07)00006-X)
- [12] I. Jurina, M. Ivanić, T. Troskot-Čorbić, D. Barišić, N. Vdović & I. Sondi, "Activity concentrations and distribution of radionuclides in surface and core sediments of the Neretva Channel (Adriatic Sea, Croatia)", *Geol. Croat.* **66** (2013) 143. <https://doi.org/10.14154/gc.2013.11>.
- [13] O. O. Oyedele, D. S. Olaniyan, J. A. Gabriel, F. H. Abejide & K. E. Adesina, "Assessing the Environmental Risk of Heavy Metals in Surrounding Areas of Lafarge Cement Industry in Shagamu, Ogun State, Nigeria". *Chemical and Environmental Science Archives* **3** (2023) 40. <https://doi.org/10.47587/CESA.2023.3204>
- [14] A. E. Akpan, N. D. Paul & E. J. Uwah, "Ground radiometric investigation of natural radiation levels and their radiological effects in Akpabuyo, Nigeria", *J. Afr. Earth Sci.* **123** (2016) 185. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jafrearsci.2016.07.023>.
- [15] N. Todorović, I. Bikit, M. Vesković, D. Mrdja, S. Forkapić, J. Hansman, J. Nikolov, K. Bikit and M. Krmar, "Radioactivity in fertilizers and radiological impact", *J Radioanal Nucl Chem* **303** (2015) 2505. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10967-014-3620-1>.
- [16] F. P. Carvalho, M. J. Madruga, M. C. Reis, J. G. Alves, J. M. Oliveira, J. Gouveia, & L. Silva, "Radioactivity in the environment around past radium and uranium mining sites of Portugal", *J. Environ. Radioact.* **96** (2007) 39. <https://doi.org/j.jenvrad.2007.01.016>
- [17] United Nations Environmental Programme, *Environmental assessment of Ogoni land*, UNEP Publication, 2011, pp. 3.
- [18] F. C. A. Ribeiro, D. Lauria, J. I. Rodrigues, S. E. Lima, N. M. Sobrinho & D. V. Pérez, "Baseline and quality reference values for natural radionuclides in soils of Rio de Janeiro State, Brazil", *Revisita Brasileira Ciencia do Solo* **42** (2018) 1. <https://doi.org/10.1590/18069657rbcsc20170146>.
- [19] R. Saint-Fort, *Understanding sorption behavior and properties of radionuclides in the environment*, InTechOpen Limited, London, United Kingdom, 2018pp 121. <https://dx.doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.76215>.
- [20] M. Momčilović, J. Kovačević, M. Tanić, M. Đorević, G. Bačić & S. Dragović, "Distribution of natural radionuclides in surface soils in the vicinity of abandoned uranium mines in Serbia", *Environ Monit Assess* **185** (2013) 1319. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-012-2634-9>.
- [21] R. Ravisankar, J. Chandramohan, A. Chandrasekaran, J. P. P. Jebakumar, I. Vijayalakshmi, P. Vijayagopal & B. Venkatraman, "Assessments of radioactivity concentration of natural radionuclides and radiological hazard indices in sediment samples from the East coast of Tamilnadu, India with statistical approach". *Mar Pollut Bull* **97** (2015) 419. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gexplo.2016.01.013>.
- [22] T. B. Chen, J. W. C. Wong, H. Y. Zhou & M. H. Wong, "Assessment of trace metal distribution and contamination in surface soils of Hong Kong". *Environ Pollut* **96** (1997) 61. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0269-7491\(97\)00003-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0269-7491(97)00003-1).
- [23] A. Binesh, S. Mohammadi, A. A. Mowlavi & P. Parvaresh "Evaluation of the radiation dose from radon ingestion and inhalation in drinking water sources of mashhad". *Int J Water Resour Environ Eng* **2** (2010) 174. <https://doi.org/10.3923/rjasci.2010.221.225>
- [24] UNSCEAR, *United Nations Scientific Committee on The effects of atomic radiation, sources and biological effects of ionizing radiation*, United Nations, New York, 1988, pp. 26.
- [25] N. A. Khalifa and A. M. El Arabi, "Natural radioactivity in farm soil and phosphate fertilizer and its environmental implications in Qena Governorate, Upper Egypt", *J. Environ. Radioact.* **84** (2005) 51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvrad.2005.04.007>.
- [26] P. P. Povinec & K. Hirose, "Fukushima radionuclides in the NW Pacific, and assessment of doses for Japanese and world population from ingestion of seafood", *Sci. Rep.* **5** (2015) 9016. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep09016>.
- [27] H. Taskin, M. Karavus, P. Ay, A. Topuzoglu, Topuzoglu S. Topuzoglu & G. Karahan, "Radionuclide concentrations in soil and lifetime cancer risk due to gamma radioactivity in Kirklareli, Turkey", *J. Environ. Radioact.* **100** (2009) 49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvrad.2008.10.012>.
- [28] C. Busby, "Aspects of DNA damage from internal radionuclides", In *New Research Directions in DNA Repair* InTech, 2013, pp. 597 <https://doi.org/10.5772/53942>
- [29] B. Michalik, J. Brown & P. Krajewski, "The fate and behaviour of enhanced natural radioactivity with respect to environmental protection". *Environ Impact Assess* **38** (2013) 163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eiar.2012.09.001>.
- [30] L. Bondareva, V. Rakitskii and I. Tananaev, "The behaviour of natural and artificial radionuclides in a river system: the Yenisei river, Russia as a case study", In *Water Quality*, 2017, pp 361. <https://doi.org/10.5772/65743>.
- [31] A. El-Gamal, S. Nasr & A. El-Taher, "Study of the spatial distribution of natural radioactivity in the upper Egypt Nile River sediments". *Radiat Meas* **42** (2007) 457. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radmeas.2007.02.054>.
- [32] P. K. Manigandan, B. C. Shekar & D. Khanna, "Root uptake/foliar uptake in a natural ecosystem", In *Radionuclides in the Environment*, C. Walther

- & D. Gupta (Eds), Springer Cham, Switzerland, 2015 pp. 133. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-22171-7\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-22171-7_7).
- [33] A. Navas, L. Gaspar, M. López-Vicente & J. Machín, “Spatial distribution of natural and artificial radionuclides at the catchment scale (South Central Pyrenees)”, *Radiat. Meas.* **46** (2011) 261. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.RADMEAS.2010.11.008>.
- [34] M. Čujić, S. Dragović, M. Đorević, R. Dragović, B. Gajić & Š. Miljanić, “Radionuclides in the soil around the largest coal-fired power plant in Serbia: radiological hazard, relationship with soil characteristics and spatial distribution”, *Environ Sci. Pollut. Res.* **22** (2015) 10317. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-014-3888-2>
- [35] N. N. Jibiri, I. P. Farai & S. K. Alausa, “Activity concentrations of  $^{226}\text{Ra}$ ,  $^{228}\text{Th}$ , and  $^{40}\text{K}$  in different food crops from a high background radiation area in Bitsichi, Jos Plateau, Nigeria”, *Radiat. Environ. Biophys.* **46** (2007) 53. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00411-006-0085-9>
- [36] A. Bramki, M. Ramdhane & F. Benrachi, “Natural radioelement concentrations in fertilizers and the soil of the Mila region of Algeria”, *J. Radiat. Res. Appl. Sci.* **11** (2018) 49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrras.2017.08.002>
- [37] M. S. Musthafa & R. Krishnamoorthy, “Estimation of  $^{210}\text{Po}$  and  $^{210}\text{Pb}$  and its dose to human beings due to consumption of marine species of Ennore Creek, South India”, *J. Environ Monit Assess* **184** (2012) 6253. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-011-2417-8>
- [38] I. Smičiklas & M. Šljivić-Ivanović, “Radioactive contamination of the soil: assessments of pollutants mobility with implication to remediation strategies” In *Soil contamination current consequences and further solutions*, IntechOpen Rijeka, Croatia, 2016, pp. 253-276. <https://doi.org/10.5772/64735>.
- [39] UNSCEAR, *Ionizing radiation sources and biological effects*, United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation, New York, 1982, pp. 7, A/37/45.
- [40] B. A. Powell, L. D. Hughes, A. M. Soreefan, D. Falta, M. Wall & T. A. DeVol, “Elevated concentrations of primordial radionuclides in sediments from the Reedy River and surrounding creeks in Simpsonville, South Carolina”. *J Environ Radioact* **94** (2007) 121. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvrad.2006.12.013>
- [41] R. T. Newman, R. Lindsay, K. P. Maphoto, N. A. Mlwilo, A. K. Mohanty, D. G. Roux, R. J. de Meijer & I. N. Hlatshwayo, “Determination of soil, sand and ore primordial radionuclide concentrations by full spectrum analyses of high-purity germanium detector spectra”, *Appl. Radiat. Isot.* **66** (2008) 855. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apradiso.2008.02.025>.
- [42] S. O. Esirole, I. Ibeanu, N. N. Garba & M. A. Onoja, “Determination of Radiological Hazard Indices from Surface Soil to Individuals in Angwan Kawo Gold Mining Sites, Niger state, Nigeria”, *J. Appl. Sci. Environ. Manage.* **23** (2019) 1541. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/jasem.v23i8.19>.
- [43] M. Akpanowo, I. Umarub, S. Iyakwari, E. J. Olugbemi, S. Yusuf & B. E. Godwin, “Determination of natural radioactivity levels and radiological hazards in environmental samples from artisanal mining sites of Anka, North-West Nigeria”, *Scientific African* **10** (2020) e00561. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sciaf.2020.e00561>.
- [44] R. J. Soja, W. L. Lucas, I. Umar, D. Y. Samson, A. M. Abdullahi, M. Idris, N. Mercy, L. B. Segna, F. Y. Dalhatu & O. O. Ignatius, “Estimation of Public Radiological Dose from Mining Activities in some Selected Cities in Nigeria”, *Dutse Journal of Pure and Applied Sciences (DUJOPAS)* **8** (2022) 22. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/dujopas.v8i1a.3>
- [45] E. Furuta, H. Minowa, H. Nakahara, K. Iwaoka & H. Yonehara, “Classification of ores used for the radiation source in NORM as consumer products by PGAA. Proc”, *Radiochim. Acta* **1** (2011) 219. <https://doi.org/10.1524/rcpr.2011.0039>.
- [46] O. O. Samuel, T. F. Pascal, A. Cornelus & M. O. Muyiwa, “Assessment of Radioactivity Levels and Transfer Factor of Natural Radionuclides Around Iron and Steel Smelting Company Located in Fashina Village, Ile-Ife, Osun State, Nigeria”, *Working and Living Environmental Protection* **15** (2018) 241. <https://doi.org/10.22190/FUWLEP18032410>.
- [47] A. Mbet, U. Ibrahim & I. Shekwonyadu, “Assessment of radiological risk from the soils of artisanal mining areas of Anka, North West Nigeria”. *African Journal of Environmental Science and Technology* **13** (2019) 303 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sciaf.2020.e00561>.
- [48] C. O. Ilemona, V. S. Iyeh, N. J. Norbert & O. S. Hammed, “Radioactivity Concentrations in Soil and Transfer Factors of Radionuclides ( $^{40}\text{K}$ ,  $^{226}\text{Ra}$  and  $^{232}\text{Th}$ ) from Soil to rice in Kogi state, Nigeria”, *Archives of Applied Science Research* **8** (2016) 34.
- [49] C. N. Iwetan, I. G. Fuwape, A. M. Arogunjo & G. Obor, “Assessment of activity concentration of radionuclides in sediment from oil producing communities of Delta State, Nigeria”, *Journal of Environmental Protection* **6** (2015) 640. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/jep.2015.66058>.
- [50] O. I. Araromi, A. O. Ojo, M. O. Olaluwoye & O. B. Odefemi, “The concentration of natural radionuclides in soil samples from the practical year agricultural farmland, University of Ibadan”, *IOSR Journal of Applied Physics* **8** (2016) 60. <https://doi.org/10.9790/4861-0804036068>.
- [51] S. B. Ibikunle, A. M. Arogunjo & O. S. Ajayi, “Characterization of radiation dose and excess lifetime cancer risk due to natural radionuclides in soils from some cities in Southwestern Nigeria”, *J. Forensic Sci. & Criminal Inves.* **10** (2018) 555793. <https://doi.org/10.19080/JFSCI2018.10.555793>.
- [52] M. M. Orosun, M. R. Usikalub, K. J. Oyewumi & T. A. Adagunodob, “Natural radionuclides and radiological risk assessment of granite mining field in Asa, North-central Nigeria”, *MethodsX* **6** (2019) 2504. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mex.2019.10.032>.
- [53] M. Goran, M. Vesna, M. Dragoslav & K. Dragana, “The dose of gamma radiation from building materials and soil”, *NUKLEONIKA* **60** (2015) 951. <https://doi.org/10.1515/nuka-2015-0148>.
- [54] United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation, *Sources and Effects of Ionizing Radiation*, UNSCEAR Publication: Report to the General Assembly, with Scientific Annexes, New York, 2000.
- [55] A. Durusoy & M. Yildirim, “Determination of radioactivity concentrations in soil samples and dose assessment for Rize Province, Turkey”, *Journal of Radiation Research and Applied Sciences* **10** (2017) 348. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrras.2017.09.005>.
- [56] A. K. Ademola, A. K. Bello & A. C. Adejumobi, “Determination of natural radioactivity and hazard in soil samples in and around gold mining area in Itagunmodi, south-western, Nigeria”, *Journal of Radiation Research and Applied Sciences* **7** (2014) 249. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jrras.2014.06.001>
- [57] O. O. Adewoyin, O. Maxwell, S. A. Akinwumi, T. A. Adagunodo, Z. Embong & M. A. Saeed, “Estimation of activity concentrations of radionuclides and their hazard indices in coastal plain sand region of Ogun state”, *Scientific Reports* **12** (2022) 1. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-06064-3>.