Qeios

Peer Review

Review of: "Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons in Brazilian Food: A Critical Review of Levels, Human Health Risk Assessment, and Potential Gaps in the Recent Literature"

Felicia Akuamoa[1]

1. Radiological and Medical Sciences Research Institute, Ghana Atomic Energy Commission (GAEC), Accra, Ghana

The review article concerns the levels of PAHs in Brazilian food, their human health risk assessment, and potential gaps in recent literature.

The introduction to the review was perfect and well-written. I enjoyed reading it; however, the entire article lacks focus on the objective of the review.

Comments:

1. Reconsider the topic since the article does not cover the entire food range in Brazil: A **Critical Review on the Levels of Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons in selected Brazilian Food: Human Health Risk Assessment and Potential Gaps in the Recent Literature.**
2. The entire structure of the article must be reviewed for coherence and comprehensive reading.
3. The full meaning of DahA when it first appears under results should be indicated.
4. The reviewed studies are inadequate, considering this is a review paper.
5. ….several studies failed to document recovery….(**indicate references to these studies**).
6. **The information on Brazil's research infrastructure, beginning** "Brazil's research infrastructure operates through a complex …. Additionally, the lack of standardized methodologies has resulted in limited interlaboratory studies, which further complicates the geographical consistency of research data. **The whole paragraph is informative but not directly related to the topic; I think it should be deleted.**

doi.org/10.32388/DZ10S7

7. **The information on the geographical consistency is not directly related to the topic and should be deleted.**
8. The information provided on the funding sources completely deviates from the topic.
9. In my opinion, the paragraph beginning with "Assessment of scientific funding reductions in Brazil reveals cumulative losses .....barriers to scientific advancement under increasingly resource-constrained conditions" is **not necessary.**
10. The paragraph, "Brazil maintains significant agricultural production capacity due to favorable climatic conditions...the Midwest region dominates with 46% of total production, followed by the South (30.4%), Southeast (9.7%), Northeast (9.1%), and North (4.8%) regions,"[76] **does not relate to the topic and should be removed.**
11. There are multiple statements about the standardization of analytical approaches/procedures. This should be limited in the article.
12. Multiple paragraphs deviate from the general topic. Some information provided only adds volume to the article, but not in context. Please consider deleting some of the information provided.
13. The article should focus on the topic and concentrate on the toxicological impacts of PAHs and compare feedback from different authors.

CONCLUSION: The article can be accepted after a major review.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.