

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

Yu Li¹

¹ North China Electric Power University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

1. Can the author explain how random sampling techniques are applicable for the investigation of PFAS toxicity?
2. The introduction lacks logic. The author could first introduce PFAS, including Perfluorooctane Sulfonate (PFOS) and Perfluoroalkyl substances, then discuss their sources, uses, and exposure pathways, and finally explore their toxicity.
3. The article should provide information on the area covered by the survey, such as the economic situation and the proportion of the population in that area.
4. The author needs to check the content of Table 2, especially the number of people who answered "Affirmative" to the first question.
5. In the discussion section, the author only briefly explains the data results and does not link the survey results to the PFAS environmental exposure and toxicity issues mentioned in the introduction, nor does it show the connection between the regional population information and the results.
6. The survey report alone cannot prove the long-distance migration and bioaccumulation of PFAS in the food chain. Is there any credibility in the author's approach to demonstrating PFAS risk exposure through a questionnaire survey? Are there other similar articles to support this?