

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

Anuschka Polder

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

**Qeios, CC-BY 4.0.** Knowledge of Risk Associated with Exposure to Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances in Abuja, Nigeria.

The main goal of this study is to find out if the population of the Abuja region, Nigeria, has knowledge of PFAS and its possible adverse health effects on humans. This is, of course, a good goal. However, in this situation, people can easily get afraid of such questions, and this must be taken care of in a proper way. People performing such investigations have an extraordinary responsibility. Giving information on environmental pollutants to populations where many people have less chance to get objective information should be very carefully done. In this perspective, one must avoid strong expressions, such as "poisonous to all life forms." The knowledge of health effects on humans from PFAS is still in the early days. Please find relevant literature on possible effects of PFAS on different species but use the word "may have effect." The whole abstract is too dramatic and must be rewritten and made more concise.

-The introduction is weak and must get a better structure. It needs rewriting and reorganization. PFAS is divided into lower and higher fluorinated groups, with different properties. This must be mentioned. Delete "use and waste generation." Include the chemical and physical properties of PFAS (water-repellant among others). The list of consumer products in which PFAS is used must be moved to the beginning. How many PFAS substances are manufactured today? Include this. The Stockholm Convention must be mentioned very early, with its intention to reduce the exposure of certain PFAS substances and other POPs. Nigeria ratified the Stockholm Convention in 2004. There are in general too few references to international studies done by scientists. Referring to international bodies such as USEPA may be OK but needs to be accompanied by serious studies done by scientists. The sentence "may be toxic to humans" must get more references to animal studies. The USA has a high production, but you forget China! How does PFAS find its way to Africa? Atmospheric transport.

"may not pose only localized risk but may progress to be a global risk or problem" – this is a weird way of saying things. PFAS is already a concern for the global community.

Concluding, the authors overstress the dangers of PFAS, while other chemicals, still used in countries like Nigeria, are much more toxic for humans. But the overstressing is maybe done to get attention around this chemical, which is of course understandable. The authors should, however, keep to a good scientific standard and keep to ethical standards of not alarming populations with less ability to get information themselves.

In Table 1, first question, is the answer 331 and 9%, and the next is 332 and 91%. One of these must be wrong. Point 5: populace must be population?

It would be wise to include the word pilot project in the title, because the number of questions is rather low and also suggestive, such as point 6, which is a leading question.