

**Thank you for finalizing your Independent Review Report - 915351**

1 message

Frontiers in Physics Editorial Office <physics.editorial.office@frontiersin.org>
Reply-To: Frontiers in Physics Editorial Office <physics.editorial.office@frontiersin.org>
To: Asaad Ismail <asaad.ismail@su.edu.krd>

Sat, Jun 11, 2022 at 12:02 PM

Dear Dr Ismail,

Thank you for submitting your independent review report for the manuscript "Radioactive Contamination in Feral Dogs in the Chernobyl Exclusion Zone: Population Body-Burden Survey and Implications for Human Radiation Exposure". As you endorsed publication of this manuscript in its current form, your peer review process is now finalized. The handling editor has been notified, and you can find a copy of your report below.

You can access the manuscript here:

<http://review.frontiersin.org/review/915351/0/0>

Best regards,

Your Frontiers in Physics team

Frontiers | Editorial Office - Collaborative Peer Review Team
www.frontiersin.org
Avenue du Tribunal Fédéral 34
Lausanne, Switzerland | T 41 21 510 17 92

For technical issues, please contact our IT Helpdesk (support@frontiersin.org) or visit our Frontiers Help Center (zendesk.frontiersin.org/hc/en-us)

-----MANUSCRIPT DETAILS-----

Manuscript title: Radioactive Contamination in Feral Dogs in the Chernobyl Exclusion Zone: Population Body-Burden Survey and Implications for Human Radiation Exposure

Manuscript ID: 915351

Authors: Jake Hecla, Erik Kambarian, Robert Tubbs, Carla Mckinley, Aaron J. Berliner, Kayla Russell, Gabrielle Spatola, Jordan Chertok, Weston Braun, Natalia Hank, Courtney Marquette, Jennifer Betz, Terry Paik, Marie Chenery, Alex Cagan, Carl Willis and Tim Mousseau

Journal: Frontiers in Physics, section Interdisciplinary Physics

Article type: Brief Research Report

Submitted on: 07 Apr 2022

Edited by: Michele Guida

Frontiers Review Guidelines

To ensure an efficient review process, please familiarize yourself with the Frontiers review guidelines. The Frontiers review process has unique features, including an interactive review stage, and a focus on objective criteria.

https://www.frontiersin.org/Journal/ReviewGuidelines.aspx?s=1433&name=interdisciplinary_physics

----- Independent Review Report, Reviewer: Asaad Ismail

EVALUATION

Please list your revision requests for the authors and provide your detailed comments, including highlighting limitations and strengths of the study and evaluating the validity of the methods, results, and data interpretation. If you have additional comments based on Q2 and Q3 you can add them as well.

Dear Authors

Greeting..

First of all, let me congratulate you on the topic of your research and on the very interesting results you have obtained during your work. I strongly believe that your paper should be published but also I am sincerely confident that it needs some revision, especially on the research method, in order to be more attractive and readable for the scientist colleagues all around the world.

I tried to suggest some improvements in the text, which I hope you will follow.

1) easurements procedures of the internal 137Cs and external beta-emitter are not clear! why 137Cs? Is the beta emitter only external radiation type?

2) 2) The authors proved that the small minority of animals with external contamination may pose a contamination hazard to workers, BUT they have not evaluated its health risks on humans. I recommend testing some hematological and biochemical tests for the workers as we did in our previous work (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nima.2021.165729>)

3) Citation style of the reference must be rearranged; for example citations of [5, 6,7,8,9,10,11,12] line 27 (introduction) must be changed to [5-12], and so on for other citation

4) The authors mentioned the " thermoluminescent dosimeter-equipped ear tags" in Figure 2. But they forget to mention that during the research methods. Also from the results, I have not found the results of the mentioned dosimeter!? please explain it

The best
Reviewer 1

Check List

a. Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes

b. Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

No

c. Are the statistical methods valid and correctly applied? (e.g. sample size, choice of test)

Yes

d. Is a statistician required to evaluate this study?

No

e. Are the methods sufficiently documented to allow replication studies?

Yes

QUALITY ASSESSMENT:

Rigor

3

Quality of the writing

4

Overall quality of the content

4

Interest to a general audience

4

You are receiving this email regarding ongoing activities you have with Frontiers. If you think this was wrongly sent to you, please contact our support team at support@frontiersin.org