- Comparative risk estimates for radiation says els, memory full ①
- Global burden and UV attribution maps,
- Survival gains with treatment milestones,
- A multidimensional ozone-melanoma heat map (innovative and compelling).

5. Writing Quality and Structure

Rating: ★★★★ (5/5)

The prose is elegant, highly readable, and scientifically mature. The writing exhibits **clarity**, **logical flow**, **and rhetorical control**, appropriate for a high-impact medical or environmental science journal. Each section transitions smoothly, and the discussion synthesises results within the broader literature meaningfully.

Minor stylistic note: Occasional overuse of qualifiers (e.g., "dramatic", "compelling") might be moderated in the final version.

6. Limitations and Transparency

Rating: $\star\star\star\star\star$ (4.5/5)

The author is commendably transparent about study limitations, particularly:

- Sparse melanoma cases in atomic bomb survivors,
- Confounding in occupational cohorts,
- Lack of individual-level UV exposure data.

A table summarising strengths and limitations by exposure type (e.g., UV vs ionising) could be a useful visual aid for readers.

7. Public Health Relevance

Rating: ★★★★★ (5/5)

This manuscript provides clear, actionable insights for both clinical practice and environmental regulation:

- · Reinforces sun safety over radiation paranoia in melanoma prevention,
- Highlights ozone recovery as a global health success,
- Suggests radiation protection standards need not revise melanoma risk assumptions.

Recommendation: ACCEPT WITH MINOR REVISIONS

Suggested Minor Revisions:

- Include a sensitivity analysis for power to detect small increases in melanoma risk from ionising radiation.
- Add a summary figure or table contrasting biological plausibility, epidemiologic evidence, and mutational signatures for UV vs ionising radiation.
- **3.** Consider softening some emphatic language ("definitive", "overwhelming") to maintain a strictly evidence-based tone.

Conclusion

This manuscript is **exceptionally well executed**, addresses a major public health issue with clarity and rigour, and is suitable for publication in a high-impact journal such as *The Lancet Oncology*, *JAMA Dermatology*, or *Environmental Health Perspectives*. It sets a new standard in multidisciplinary synthesis regarding melanoma risk and radiation exposure.

Let me know if you'd like this review in a formal PDF format or formatted for submission to a specific journal.