

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on Cure or carcinogen? A framing analysis of European radon spa websites

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Petros Koutrakis

Submitted on: 28 Nov 2021

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2022.1604559

### EVALUATION

#### **Q 1** Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The authors reviewed websites of "therapeutic" in Europe. They found that there is little disclosure about the potential radon exposures and effects.

#### **Q 2** Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

This was not an exhaustive study but its information can be critical to efforts to address a serious public health problem. Recent research indicates that radon is not just a carcinogen but also it can cause cardiovascular and respiratory effects for relative short exposure windows (e.g., days to weeks). The effects were observed for concentration levels lower to guidelines based on lung cancer.

#### **Q 3** Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

The work was not meant to be a very technical one. It was simple survey so there is not much it can be done. However, it had a clear message of great public health importance.

### PLEASE COMMENT

#### **Q 4** Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes, as I said this was not an exhaustive study but can influence public health policies. Also it will raise awareness for the scientific community and the funding agencies to assess exposures and effects associated with the spa practices.

#### **Q 5** Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes

#### **Q 6** Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes

#### **Q 7** Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Not Applicable.

**Q 8** Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?)

Yes

**QUALITY ASSESSMENT**

**Q 9** Originality

**Q 10** Rigor

**Q 11** Significance to the field

**Q 12** Interest to a general audience

**Q 13** Quality of the writing

**Q 14** Overall scientific quality of the study

**REVISION LEVEL**

**Q 15** Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Accept.