

Manuscript: “**Hormesis Effect of Radon in Rats of the Krushinsky-Molodkina Line**”

Submitted: 24 November 2021

Accepted: 09 February 2022

Published: 30 April 2022

Corresponding Author: Marine Nikolaishvili

Doi:10.19044/esj.2022.v18n14p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Sesili Berishvili, European University, Georgia

Reviewer 2: Patricia Randrianavony, University of Antananarivo/Madagascar

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: Sesili Berishvili PhD	
University/Country: European University, Georgia	
Date Manuscript Received: 26.12.2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 29.12.2021
Manuscript Title: Hormesis effect of radon in rats of the Krushinsky-Molodkina line	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1237/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
The title it is clear and adequate I agree with the content of the article	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
The methods used are modern with relevant research, Methods and results are clearly presented and explained in the abstract and this is clearly shown in the abstract	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4,5
There is a slight grammatical error in the text that may not be considered a mistake, The text is simple and clear, which makes the article even better to read.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
The methods are quite well explained, The methods used are modern with relevant research,	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
The results are clearly given and it reflects well the scientific value of the work done	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The conclusions are accurately reflected and consistent with the text, but could have been more extensive and exhaustive, but it completely agrees with the text of the article	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
References include both old and new, and the old can be said to contain classical data on epilepsy, and I agree with the author that he used this bibliography as references 11 and 12	

--

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The article is written in pretty good English, the latest methods are used, the topic is in pilot medicine it belongs to the field of clinical and translational medicine, I am glad that this article came to me for review.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I want to thank you for sending me this article and for giving me the opportunity to become familiar with modern translational medicine. I think that such modern articles should be published, and not new medications that have side effects, namely those methods that have no side effects, in this case, small doses of radiation, which have a hormesis effect.

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: Patricia Randrianavony	
---------------------------------------	--

University/Country: University of Antananarivo/Madagascar	
Date Manuscript Received: 01-02-2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 03-02-2022
Manuscript Title: Hormesis effect of radon in rats of the Krushinsky-Molodkina line	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 37-12-2021	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>abstract presents objects, methods and results</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Very few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>study methods are well explained except the Radon inhalations duration</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>results are clear and do not contain errors</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>references are comprehensive and appropriate</i>	

--

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	x
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: