

Peer Review

Review of: "Bladder Chemical Carcinogens in the Workplace"

Biagio Barone¹

1. Urology, Azienda Sanitaria Locale Napoli 1 Centro, Napoli, Italy

General comment

The manuscript entitled “Bladder Chemical Carcinogens in the Workplace” presents a thorough and well-structured overview of the role of occupational exposure in the etiology of bladder cancer. The historical and epidemiological perspectives are well-supported with references, and the discussion of various chemical agents provides valuable insights. However, several areas could benefit from greater clarity, additional evidence, and improved organization to enhance readability and impact. In detail:

- The influence of occupational exposure in non-Western countries should be briefly mentioned.
- The claim that general practitioners and specialists lack knowledge about occupational risk factors needs further substantiation with references or studies.
- About Nitrosamines, the discussion could be strengthened by providing more recent occupational studies that assess bladder cancer risk specifically associated with these compounds. To this regard, also see: [10.3390/cancers14194775](https://doi.org/10.3390/cancers14194775) and [10.1016/j.urolonc.2024.11.015](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urolonc.2024.11.015)
- The link between trichloroethylene and kidney cancer is well known, but the connection between these solvents and bladder cancer is less established. Additional references supporting this claim are necessary.
- About novel risk factors in bladder cancer, also consider [10.3390/jpm13030512](https://doi.org/10.3390/jpm13030512)
- The manuscript correctly highlights the disparities in exposure risk, but further discussion of existing regulatory gaps or protections for these workers would be beneficial.
- Terms such as “bladder carcinogens” and “occupational bladder cancer” should be used consistently throughout the manuscript.
- Several references date back to the early 2000s. Inclusion of more recent studies (past 5–10 years) would strengthen the discussion.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.