Specific comments

No.	Page	Paragraph	Location	Comment
1	4, 6, 34, 55 etc.	MAIN POINT, EXECUTIVE SUMMARY, Table 3.1, 6.1 etc.	"within or below the Commission's recommended band of 1-20 mSv"	The term "or below" should be removed. It is sufficient to only mention the Commission's recommended range, i.e. within 1-20 mSv. Furthermore, if this publication wishes to retain the sentence "the most appropriate reference level may be lower than the corresponding band" mentioned in Table 3.1 and 6.1, reasonable discussions and explanations need to be added in the relevant paragraphs to clarify: (1) how a reference level of below 1 mSv/year can be justified; and (2) how to ensure consistency with a dosage limit of 1 mSv/year in planned situations. Although exposures from both natural sources and from radionuclides due to the nuclear accident are categorized as the same situation, i.e. existing exposure situation, does the ICRP think 'interventions' against the area where exposure from natural sources is below 1 mSv/year can be also justified? Implementing 'Interventions' against the same dosage level of 'practices' in planned exposure situations would cause confusion and may lose the reasonable balance of radiation protection.
2	9	6	"this publication focuses on the protection of people and the environment in the case of a large nuclear accident."	Although this scope is conveyed in the title, it should be stated more clearly in the Main points.
3	11	Table 2.1		Table 2.1 should include the declaration "temporary infertility (males), 0.1 Gy acute dose to the testis" as described in Table 4.4 of the Pub. 118. It is inconsistent with the sentence in paragraph 18.
4	12	22	Lines 327–330	The comment on 0.5% to 25% risk of fatal cancer that is added by a dose above 100 mSv requires additional clarification (e.g., is this a lifetime risk, relative changes, or absolute risk; is the variation among tissues, ages, or other factors) because the cited references do not seem evident while giving the values of 0.5% to 25%.
5	12	24	Lines 340–341	The sentence "In time, there are changes in biodiversity, linked to a variety of factors including the lack of human diversity" needs a reference.
6	12	24	Lines 345	A reference about Chernobyl (IAEA, 2006) should be included in addition to the reference about Fukushima (UNSCEAR, 2013). Reference IAEA, 2006. Environmental Consequences of the Chernobyl Accident and their Remediation: Twenty Years of Experience. International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna.
7	13 and 16	25 and 47	Line 351–354 and Line 512–518	There is no reference for the active protection of the environment against the detrimental effects of radiation exposure even in the intermediate and long-term phases. On the other hand, the possibility and necessity of active radiation protection of the environment during the recovery process itself is included in paragraph (47), Line 512-518. It is necessary to resolve this contradiction.
8	16	46	Line 505 pets and livestock	Insert "nursing dogs". The exposure on nursing-dogs would be an important factor when deciding whether to take nursing-dogs to a waiting room for a PET patient
9	16	46	Lines 502–506	Ideally pets should be protected at a level that is similar to the protection of humans. In the case of livestock, the most important consequence is the contamination of their products and their protection is not a matter of the high priority, although some measures for pain relief or removal including slaughtering might be required from the perspective of animal welfare. Are these ideas included in the terms "appropriate measure" and "specific arrangements to preserve their welfare"?
10	16	46	Lines 504–506	The commission recommends that appropriate measures should be taken to arrange welfare for pets and livestock in the emergency response planning processes. It is desirable that clear guidance should be provided for the specific measures. In addition, it is preferable to describe practical issues in "3.4. Protection of the public and the environment".
11	17	51	"particularly representatives of local authorities, professionals, and inhabitants of affected communities,"	Practically, it is often difficult to identify the "representatives" of inhabitants. The word "representatives" is not necessary in this sentence.

12	18	54	Line 577 Lessons learned from the Fukushima accident, for example, suggest that the unplanned evacuation of elderly or medically-supervised people from nursing homes may have caused more harm than good fo these people (Tanigawa et al., 2012).	Even iodine 131, which is a problem in early phases, needs about 8 days to become the half of the first value, and 16 days to become 1/4. In the case of a large accident that releases a large amount of the radionuclides into the environment, there is no option to "wait there until it becomes safe". However, this description promotes “wait there until it becomes safe”. Insert "After the accident, the area around the hospital should be considered a no access area and the hospital should be isolated. The hospitals must stockpile food, water, fuel, and consumables so that they can wait in the hospitals until an appropriate evacuation plan and an evacuation site are identified. They should identify several evacuation sites in advance, and transportation methods that do not cause distress to the patients and caregivers should be considered in advance. They should also consider receiving assistance from the staff of other areas."
13	20	66	“ The Commission therefore pays particular attention to equity in the distribution of exposure within the groups”	Equity consideration is needed because of limited resources. This point needs a better explanation.
14	21	69	self-help	Self-supporting is a better description for this concept.
15	22	73	Lines 754–756	Comment should be added on the correct use of a thyroid equivalent dose as a point of reference.
16	22	74	Line 762 Experience has shown that reference levels were sometimes used during the emergency response and the recovery process as dose limits.	The current Japanese law adopts a criminal statutory law, so it is necessary to clarify what a crime is. Therefore, there is no clear boundary to differentiate between legal and illegal, which cannot be further defined by the Japanese legal system.
17	22	74	“and thus may well be exceeded by some individuals as the optimization process begins or continues”	This point is important and is better understood when it is explained that “exceed” should be within expectation or what is allowed.
18	23	78	“maintaining exposure below or in the range of 100 mSv […] intake of radioiodine.	This publication focuses on ‘the event of a large nuclear accident’ such as the accidents in Chernobyl and Fukushima. As internal exposure to radioiodine was a critical issue after these accidents, one of the essential roles of this publication would be to discuss and provide a certain range of general reference level of thyroid equivalent dose.
19	23	78	“ the Commission recommends that the reference level for restricting exposures of the affected population and the emergency responders should generally not exceed 100 mSv.”	The rationale for the same reference level for the general population and responders should be explained. This point needs to be compared with public exposure limits vs. occupational limits.
20	24	78	“It should be noted that maintaining exposure below or in the range of 100 mSv effective dose is no guarantee of the absence of excess incidence of thyroid cancer in a population when there has been intake of radioiodine.”	This is probably true. The explanation should include the dose absorbed by the organ or an equivalent dose for the organ.
21	24	78	Line 815 maintaining exposure	Clear explanation is required to define what "maintaining exposure" means.
22	24	79	“recovery responders should not exceed 20 mSv per year on-site and off-site”	Relation of this value to the annual occupational limit of 50 mSv needs to be explained. A responder probably works in only one incident every year.
23	24	80	Lines 834–836	The expression "on the possible increase in the number of cancer cases imposed by an exposure in the range of 100 mSv", although based on Publication 103, sounds like the Commission admits a threshold dose for cancer risk. A possible modification may be: ‘… whole-body exposure in the range of 100 mSv can lead to a considerable increase in the number of cancer cases among exposed populations’.
24	24	80		In this paragraph, “10mSv” is described as the key benchmark dose, however the evidence of the description seemed very poor. In the both annexes, there are no descriptions about that residents who were living with a dosage of over 10 mSv/year could not maintain a sustainable living. Further justification of the 10 mSv is required. If there are no evidence for the justification of the 10 mSv, the value should not be included in the document.
25	24	81	“The Commission recommends that […] in non-affected areas”	The concept of 1 mSv seems to be different from that mentioned in Para. 50 of ICRP Pub. 111 which indicates that 1 mSv is just ‘a typical value’ used in previous circumstances. ICRP Publ. 111 recommended that only “the reference level should be selected from the lower part of the 1-20 mSv/year band”, not the description “some types of protective actions should be maintained as long as a significant proportion of the affected population receive exposures above 1 mSv/year”. Although it is unlikely to be acceptable for the people living in the affected areas in most cases, selecting a value above 1 mSv/year as the eventual reference level to finish any protective actions is not needed to be excluded from the possible reasonable options after optimization.

26	24 and 38	81 and 140	Lines 848–851 and Lines 1432–1438	The ICRP recommends that protective measures should be maintained during the recovery process as long as the population is exposed to more than 1 mSv per year (Para 81); the reference level includes both external and internal exposures. This report also describes that the radiological criteria for foodstuffs may be set lower or higher than the Codex guideline levels (1 mSv per year) (Para 140). If the level for foodstuffs is set to 1mSv in the same way as in Japan, the total internal and external exposure dose may exceed 1 mSv. This discrepancy may lead to a misunderstanding by the public and can disturb communications among stakeholders. A clear explanation is required for the reference level and the level of foodstuffs in paragraph 140.
27	24	81	"The Commission recommends that some types of protective actions should be maintained during the recovery process as long as a significant proportion of the affected population receive exposures above 1 mSv per year, a level that is close or similar to exposure situations in non-affected areas."	This value, 1 mSv, is excluding BG. Thus, a similar exposure situation in unaffected areas is strange statement. Excess dose in unaffected area should be zero.
28	25	83	Lines 869–872	The meaning of the sentence "However, DCRLs may be useful in communicating the implications of the situation to stakeholders, particularly in relation to environmental conditions where humans have been removed from the area, and food chains leading to human exposure have been discontinued." is not clear.
29	25	83	Lines 873–878	Are "environmental reference values" and "DCRLs" same or different?
30	27	89	Lines 936–938	Our experience tells that not only the affected population but also other people should be informed depending on their interest (J Disaster Res 10: 716-727, 2015), because the boundary between affected and non-affected areas is ambiguous and/or not shared among people in the early phase. Also, leaving unaffected areas insufficiently informed can result in lack of correct knowledge among distantly evacuated people.
31	28	94	Lines 980–982	In this text, fish from contaminated rivers and lakes were described as a factor for internal radiation exposure. However, it is strange to limit only for freshwater fish because seafood was also contaminated. It is better to use "aquatic products from contaminated water" rather than "fish from contaminated rivers and lakes".
32	28	94	Lines 981–982	"Wild berries and mushrooms from contaminated forests" was mentioned in the text, but in Japan, we do not eat many berries from the wild but issues arose with other edible wild plants (e.g. bamboo shoots, new shoots of trees and herbs). Thus it is better to change the term "wild berries and mushrooms" to "edible wild plants and mushrooms".
33	28	94		It is better to mention the beef (or animal product) contamination pathway from not highly contaminated areas. Rice straw which was spread onto fields to dry during the winter season is used as feed for cattle and as a component of cattle beds were contaminated beef thus exceeded the provisional value in 2011 in Japan. It is, therefore, better to note that pathway in the text.
34	28	95	Line 992 For direct or indirect releases of radioactive material into the sea, people can be exposed externally from radionuclides in the sea or sea sediments. The doses from these pathways are not expected to make significant contributions to the overall exposure.	The Ministry of Environment sets an upper limit for the concentration of radiocesium for swimming in the sea. https://www.env.go.jp/jishin/rmp/attach/no120608001.pdf （in Japanese） When the dose is close to the dosage limit due to other contributions, it may be unavoidable to measure for safety even if the contribution is known to be low. We would like to insert "Exposure while sea bathing should be considered separately".
35	28	96	Lines 1000–1003	Internal exposure is explained with higher animals in mind. More generalized description for a wide range of animals and plants is necessary.
36	28	98	3.2.2.1 Einvironmental monitoring	It should be noted that a portable survey meter should be prepared in consideration of the fact that the installed survey meter will be contaminated and will not show the correct value.
37	29	101	"transportable in-vivo monitoring devices"	Not necessarily transportable. The residents can be transferred to a measurement center depending on the situation.
38	31	109	Line 1148	"Breastfeeding women" should be added. (ref. ICRP pub. 96 para 85)
39	32	114	Line 1190	Please clarify what 'prejudice of the responsibility of each employer' means.
40	32-33	114		When the accident size becomes larger, then the intermediate phase tends to gets longer. This means the protection of on-site emergency responders should be carefully considered and managed for (several weeks, months, or years). A continuous supply of good quality food and drinking water is an important factor to those responders, but this was not mentioned in the text. At the site, external dose mainly contributes to human dose though internal dose also needs to be take care of.
41	33	115	their informed consent	Need clear explanation regarding consent contents. Is this required for the risk of stochastic effects or the development of accident or discrimination, etc.?
42	33	116	Line 1208	The reference level of up to 100 mSv "per year" may be misleading; a better option would be "100 mSv in a short period, not exceeding a year".

43	34	Table 3.1	Column 'Intermediate phase'	1) The reference level of =<100 (or 20) mSv 'per year' may be misleading; a better option would be '100 (or 20) mSv in a short period, not exceeding a year'. 2) Intention of 'n/a' is unclear.
44	35	124	Line 1293 However, evacuation can be inappropriate for certain populations, such as patients in hospitals and nursing homes, as well as elderly people, if it is not well planned (Tanigawa, 2012).	It should be taken in the direction of "Then It should be well planned." The following issues have occurred in the evacuation in Fukushima. · Insufficient resources while waiting for evacuation (up to 5 days to evacuate) · A shortage of evacuation destinations (evacuation destination was not found) · Inappropriate evacuation measures (forced unreasonable posture to patients and care recipients. For example, some people have difficulty sitting on chairs) · Insufficient rest during evacuation (moving continuously for 12 hours) · Lack of staff · Lack of nursing care at the evacuation destination These points should be considered because it is common to evacuation from other disasters (such as floods and earthquakes).
45	35		3.4.1.1 Evacuation	Paragraph 46 describes pets and livestock. It should also be stated that the government is considering whether pets can be taken in case of an evacuation. In the case of Fukushima, pets and livestock were not evacuated since they intended on returning soon, so the livestock were killed while they were connected, they became wild, or the pets were left as they were. It should also be considered whether it is possible to return temporarily to take care of livestock even if it becomes an evacuation area. In some cases, volunteers of animal welfare organizations who temporarily visit to take care of livestock or to feed abandoned pets temporarily enter these areas.
46	37	131	Line 1357 Adverse effects of potassium iodine on thyroid function are more common in individuals with pre-existing thyroid disorders other than cancer. These disorders are more common in older adults and the elderly than in children and young adults.	The harm from the intake of potassium as well as iodine should be described. For example, dialysis patients are limited to 1500 to 2000 mg of potassium per day, and on the day and the next day they will have to reduce potassium in their diet. Infants and children should be more restricted and parents may need to consult their physician.
47	37	134	Lines 1385–1387	This sentence mentioned not to eat food that may have been outside during the release and thereby contaminated, but additionally crops grown in greenhouses need to be take care of because outside air blows in to the facility in many cases and thus gets contaminated. The incident was observed during food monitoring in Japan after the accident, therefore not only food that may have been outside, but also any food with proximity to the contamination pathway was considerable should not be eaten.
48	38	140	Some local communities	Based on CODEX Alimentarius, specific cases should be noted as in the following sentence. "….. for some local communities (e.g., in the case of wide-spread radioactive contamination) (CAC, 2010); hence, ……" *reference Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC). Codex general standard for contaminants and toxins in food and feed. CODEX STAN 193-1995 (Amended 2010); 2010.
49	38	140	…. internation trade (FAO/WHO, 2006).	This reference is old and inappropriate. New literature should be cited as follows. ".....international trade (CAC, 2010)." *reference Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC). Codex general standard for contaminants and toxins in food and feed. CODEX STAN 193-1995 (Amended 2010); 2010.
50	38	140	……2006). These levels are based……	There is no mention about CODEX's perception on safety for guideline levels. It should be noted as in the following sentence. "….2006). The Codex Guideline levels can be used by countries to control imported foods (when radionuclide levels in food do not exceed the corresponding Guideline levels, the food should be considered as safe for human consumption) (CAC, 2011). These levels are based……" *Reference Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC). Fact Sheet on Codex Guideline Levels for Radionuclides in Foods Contaminated Following a Nuclear or Radiological Emergency; 2011.

51	40	153 or whole section 3.5;	Line 153 or whole section 3.5;	Economical situation including compensation for evacuation etc. is one of the factors influencing the decision or opinion of residents in the real world. This point should be mentioned briefly, probably somewhere in this section.
52	40-41	154		This section explains sheltering mainly and it is better included in section 3.4, in the early and intermediate phase.
53	43	164	“measurement of individual external and internal doses”	In addition to measurement, simulation or calculation should be included here.
54	46	176	“ For people employed for various economic activities in an affected area, the Commission recommends that they should be treated as members of the public,”	It is understandable that a lower dosage limit is required for some groups of employed people in an affected area. However, they continue working in the area, thus the general rule should be a category of occupation rather than the public.
55	50	199	“regular medical check-ups should be established,”	Mental care should be also mentioned here.
56	50	201	“with 100–500 mGy absorbed dose to the thyroid.”	The upper limit of 500 mGy is not required. Alternatively, it can be “with 100–500 mGy absorbed dose or above the thyroid.”
57	55	226	Lines 2113–2115	This sentence could be replaced by the following sentence: The Commission recommends in Publication 124 (ICRP, 2014) that the DCRL bands themselves can be used as references for biota.
58	55	Table 6.1	2nd footnote (†)	Please consider adding a comment like "This is different from the criteria set by the authority on the decision of the return of evacuated people" should be added, in order to prevent misunderstanding that this contradicts with the criterion of 20 mSv per year for returning in Fukushima. This is because, in Japan, such misunderstanding on the current draft is already appearing in social media.
59	56	Table 6.1	severe deterministic effects	The citation alone does not reveal what "severe deterministic effects" specifically means. I want you to include a specific description.
60	61-86	Annex B.		There are a few descriptions about restrictions on the consumption of foodstuff in the annex B. During the early stage, because we learned from the Chernobyl accident that iodine-131 intake through milk needs to be avoided, farmers near the site disposed milk voluntary before the announcement from the government. It is better to record such initiatives by the farmers in Fukushima.
61	73 and 86	Section A.5 and B.5		Please check the timelines for these accidents to ensure each duration fits as defined in 2.1 (p. 10).
62	76	B 3	Line 2925 However, the evacuation of approximately 78,000 residents from the 20-km zone was complete by 15 March 2011	Paragraph 46 describes pets and livestock, and Chernobyl also describes pets and livestock in Paragraph A8, but Annex B does not describe the same. It should be described as in the following text: “Most pets and livestock were abandoned during the evacuation. No investigation was done on the number of abandoned animals, but there were problems such as the cows becoming wild.”
63	77	B 6	Line 2944 These values were adopted from the criteria in the regulatory guide by the Nuclear Safety Commission.	We don't think it's an explanation based on numbers. These values were calculated based on 5 mSv per year for cesium (radioactive iodine is 50 mSv per year for thyroid), and only a few months to apply in areas where public exposure remains 1 mSv Value. （Reference) Hamada and Ogino, 2012, J. Env. Radioactivity, 111, 83-99 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvrad.2011.08.008
64	78	B 10	Line 2983 During the response,	Other descriptions mention the month when the incident occurred, so we would like it tally. The exact date this happened was March 14th. (Reference) https://www.mhlw.go.jp/topics/2016/01/dl/tp0115-1-01-04p.pdf

65	78–81	Section B.3		The following paragraph could be added somewhere in section B.3: Many pets and livestock were abandoned during the evacuation of people. Evacuation of the remaining pets in the “restricted area” commenced in May 2011. This evacuation campaign by the national / local governments and relevant organizations continued for a long duration, and 442 dogs and 456 cats were evacuated by October 2012 (MOE, 2012). On the other hand, the livestock abandoned in the “restricted area” were euthanized following the decision by the national government in May 2011 (MAFF, 2015). This slaughter disposition continued for a long duration, and approximately 1700 cattle and 3400 pigs were euthanized by January 2014. References MOE, 2012. Press release, Ministry of the Environment, Japan. http://www.env.go.jp/press/press.php?serial=16026 MAFF, 2015. Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, Japan. http://www.maff.go.jp/j/kanbo/kihyo02/fukkou/pdf/2709_bun_2-3.pdf
66	81	Section B.4	Line 3119 Before B.4.1 Recovery responders	It should be added that special medical examinations are conducted for emergency responders who received high doses. ・Emergency responders who received an effective dose during emergency work that exceeded 50 mSv per year undergo eye examinations for cataract using a slit lamp microscope once a year. ・Emergency responders whose effective dose received during emergency work exceeded 100 mSv per year undergo gastric cancer screening, lung cancer screening, and colorectal cancer screening once a year. （Reference） Guidelines for maintaining and improving the health of emergency workers in nuclear facilities, etc. （in Japanese） https://www.mhlw.go.jp/file/06-Seisakujouhou-11200000-Roudoukijunkyoku/0000096472.pdf
67	85	B 39	Line 3237	Consider changing ‘between’ to ‘among’.
68	86	B 42		The following section could be added in relation to non-human biota after the section B.4.7: B.4.8. Protection of non-human biota In order to assess the impact of radioactive materials on non-human biota, the national government started analyses of wild animals and plants in the “restricted area” in 2012 (MOE, 2016; UNSCEAR, 2017). In addition to examine the biological effects of radiation exposure, radioactivity concentrations were measured in wildlife samples and environmental media, and dosage rates to wildlife were estimated from those measurements. Radiation risks were characterized by comparing the estimated dosage rates with DCRLs recommendations by the Commission for biota. Similar risk assessment was carried out by UNSCEAR and IAEA based on monitoring data in the “restricted area” (UNSCEAR, 2013; IAEA, 2015c). It was concluded that any radiation effects would be restricted to a limited area where the accumulation of radioactive material was greatest, and, beyond that area, the potential for effects on biota would be insignificant. References MOE, 2016. Press release, Ministry of the Environment, Japan. https://www.env.go.jp/jishin/monitoring/results_wl_d160830.pdf UNSCEAR, 2013. Report of the united nations scientific committee on the effects of atomic radiation to the general assembly, United Nations, New York. UNSCEAR, 2017. Developments since the 2013 UNSCEAR Report on the levels and effects of radiation exposure due to the nuclear accident following the great east Japan earthquake and tsunami. A 2017 white paper to guide the Scientific Committee's future program of work. United Nations, New York. http://www.unscear.org/docs/publications/2017/UNSCEAR_WP_2017_Fukushima_Attachment.pdf
69	86	Table B.1		It is strange that the date at the end of the early phase, which means when the risk of the release of radionuclides ends, is different between offsite and onsite.

Editorial comments

No.	Page	Line	Location	Comment
1	General			Appropriate citations should be added to all text that begins with the term "The Commission recommends".
2	009	225	1991	1991a,b
3	012	312	Little, 2002	Insert "et al."
4	012	330	Ogino, 2014	Insert "and Hattori" Ogino and Hattori, 2014
5	013	390	Sawano, 2018	Insert "et al."
6	014	433	Bromet, 2011	Insert "et al."
7	014	433	Harada, 2015	Insert "et al."
8	014	434	Sususki, 2015	Rewrite "Suzuki, et al., 2015"
9	014	434	Maeda, 2017	Insert "et al."
10	015	453	Hasegawa, 2015	Insert "et al."
11	015	460	Luccioni, 2016	Insert "et al."
12	015	467	Nomura, 2016	Insert "et al."
13	015	467	Ono, 2017	Insert "et al."
14	020	652		Delete "Para 34"
15	021	705		Delete "Para 218"
16	021	709		Delete "Para 219"
17	023	801		Delete "Para 236"
18	024	851		Delete "Para 50"
19	026	912	Callen et al., 2017	Callen and Homma, 2017
20	030	1066	Hayano, 2014	Insert "et al."
21	035	1295	Tanigawa, 2012	Insert "et al."
22	047	1178	Bogdevich et al.	Delete "et al." There are no co-authors in this paper
23	049	1881	Skuterud et al.	Skuterud and Thorring
24	050	1930	Togawa, 2018	Insert "et al."
25	051	1952	Liland et al.,	Liland and Skuterud
26	051	1952	Takamura, 2018	Insert "et al."
27	054	2076	NEA-OECD	OECD/NEA
28	058	2205	ICRP Publication 108	This document is not cited in the text.
29	059	2261	OECD/NEA 2000	This document is not cited in the text.
30	058	2156	Bromet, E. J. 2014.	Bromet, E. J., 2014. （Insert "," ）
31	059	2275	Ono, A., Isojima, T., Yokoya, S., et al. 2017.	Ono, A., Isojima, T., Yokoya, S., et al., 2017. （Insert "," ）
32	060	2282	Sawano T., Nishikawa, Y., Ozaki A., Leppold C., Tsubokura M. 2018.	Sawano T., Nishikawa, Y., Ozaki A., et al., 2018.
33	060	2285	Schneider T., Andronopoulos S., Camps J., Duranova T., Gallego E., Gering F., Isnard O., Maître M., Murith C., Oughton D., Raskob W.	Schneider T., Andronopoulos S., Camps J., et.al.,
34	076	2926	However, the evacuation of approximately 78,000 2925 residents from the 20-km zone was complete by 15 March 2011	Insert "." at the end of sentence.

35	087	3277	IAEA, 2015a	This document is not cited in the text.
36	087	3298	NAIIC,2012	This document is not cited in the text.
37	090	3392	Practical radiological protection culture	This glossary moves between 3365 and 3366.