

Peer Review

Review of: "Bladder Chemical Carcinogens in the Workplace"

Catalina Ciocan¹

1. Occupational Medicine, University of Turin, Italy

The topic of bladder cancer and bladder occupational carcinogen exposure is of high interest, but the paper doesn't refer to new scientific evidence; rather, it refers to old and dated scientific data. I think that the personal opinion of the author must be backed by epidemiologic data. For example, if we look at the carcinogenic aromatic amines, all evidence points to the absence of a risk excess for bladder cancer for cohorts employed after 1975. So we are talking about a risk that was present for exposures not 20 years ago, but 50 or 60 years ago. The same is true for PAHs. A starting point should be the new epidemiologic evidence in the occupational and non-occupational cohorts regarding known risk factors (like those listed in the article) as well as new risk factors. Moreover, the investigation of occupational exposure has been previously structured and described in many cohort and case-control studies, so it is not a new tool for medical professionals. It can be widely used for the etiological definition of cancer cases. It also allows for the exclusion of all other risk factors that can be confounders for the analysis of the cases.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.