

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_105004
Title of the Manuscript:	Radioadapted Response Early Effects and Late Effects on Survival of White Blood Cells in Mice (Mus Musculus L) Post C0-60 Gamma Radiation
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>[1] The manuscript has great relevance; the experimental study meets other fundamentals of radiobiology.</p> <p>[2] The Title is brief but enlightening, I suggest a verb at the beginning such as: Experimental evaluation, etc.</p> <p>[3] The abstract describes well the objective, methodology and results.</p> <p>[4] The parts of the manuscript are in line with the results, which proved to be easy to read.</p> <p>[5] In general, the parts of the manuscript are in accordance with scientific rigor and very well written.</p> <p>[6] The references are in accordance with the methodological proposal for an experimental study.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The technical language of the manuscript is clear, and the tables and figures better elucidate the text.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript contributes and updates these concepts, especially in the adaptive response of white blood cells as a function of radiation dose, which reinforces the challenges of radiotherapy, due to the heterogeneity of lymphoma and prostate treatments.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Thiago Victorino Claus
Department, University & Country	Franciscan University, Brazil