

# Review of: "Improving the Integration of Epidemiological Data Into Human Health Risk Assessment: What Risk Assessors Told Us They Want"

James C. Hurley<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Melbourne

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This report presents the survey results of 75 respondents to a questionnaire on epidemiology research completed by 'risk assessors'.

It is too long [>10,000 words] and overly opinionated. There are surprisingly only eight references. It is the first manuscript I have read in several thousand to quote The Spice Girls! References to published studies that were or were not valid would be useful.

The abstract lacks numeric results.

With a description of the research question, the survey methods, and some numeric results in the abstract, this article would have a greater impact.

Line 1, "To what extent is epidemiology, as currently practiced, perceived as useful for human health risk assessment?" is not a research question.

What or who are 'risk assessors'?

The word 'epidemiology' appears frequently throughout the manuscript, but I am unclear what is meant. I am certain that the meaning does not correspond to a dictionary definition. I suspect that this means environmental health surveys.

The text from respondents appears throughout the manuscript. However, I am left wondering whether these comments are meant to be taken seriously or might be something that might appear on 'Trip Advisor'. I do wonder if the authors intentionally used deliberate irony in reporting the results of a study of the deficiencies of 'epidemiology' that incorporates all the faults that are being attributed to 'epidemiology'!

As the authors state in the Conclusions, "yeah, right; good luck with that."