

Review of: "Knowledge of Risk Associated with Exposure to Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances in Abuja, Nigeria"

Carolyn A. Sonter¹

¹ University of New England

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I appreciate that the authors have put a lot of work into this review. However, I cannot recommend it be published in its current form. I will address the issues below:

The abstract needs work for the following reasons:

Line 2 - states that PFAS don't occur freely in nature but are produced industrially. This is ambiguous because pre-PFAS and breakdown products are not always produced in a laboratory (even though the original precursors are) and are often present in nature without being intentionally put there by whoever used a product containing the precursors.

Line 3 - Stating that PFAS is poisonous is misleading. It elicits toxicity at some concentrations. At low concentrations, no effects may be observed.

The abstract states that the study was to ascertain knowledge of PFAS and highlight the risk of exposure. Exposure routes are not explored in this review and need to be explored to show the relevance of the subject matter, i.e., PFAS.

Stating PFAS may progress to be a global risk by basing that assumption on the knowledge of one country is a supposition that really cannot be made. This needs rewording to apply only to Nigeria and/or Africa, and the reason given.

Overall, the abstract makes very general statements which do not provide a good assessment of the review.

Comments regarding the main body of the review:

The introduction is very general and should contain information regarding exposure routes (i.e., how humans may be exposed), toxicity concentrations, sources of contamination.

How is marital status relevant to this study?

What PFAS are residents being exposed to? Short chain, long-chain?

Reference is made to imported products - what are these? How is exposure occurring - by eating/wearing/drinking/bathing in the products?

Overall, there are so many issues with this review that it does not contribute value to current knowledge about PFAS exposure without major rework. A review should answer questions regarding:

The subject matter, i.e., PFAS, human exposure

What is currently known about the subject, i.e., prior research to date - there are numerous excellent studies that were not included

What is not known (the reason for the study), i.e., why we need to do the research

The outcome, i.e., what we now know

Future recommendations

This review barely touched on any of the above, and for that reason, I recommend that it is rejected.