

Peer Review

Review of: "Bladder Chemical Carcinogens in the Workplace"

Bogdan Novac^{1,2}

1. Urology, Grigore T. Popa University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Iași, Romania; 2. Urology and Renal Transplantation, Spitalul Clinic Dr. C. I. Parhon, Iasi, Romania

Although the paper tackles an extremely popular and accepted topic in the academic world, mentioning certain compounds that have the potential to explain carcinogenesis in bladder tumors cannot serve as the basis for concluding that these compounds should be considered the reason those patients developed bladder cancer. The author even points out that the studies yield different results with a very wide variation (between 5% and 20%). The paper is structured more as an opinion rather than as evidence that these substances cause the occurrence of bladder cancer. I believe that the paper could benefit from selecting or conducting studies that certify that the absence of some of these substances results in significantly lower incidences compared to groups of exposed patients. This comparison could be considered credible evidence and could further support the conclusion advocating for the cessation of the widespread use of these products and for encouraging patients to consider occupational disease as a component in the etiology of bladder cancer.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.