

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_102288
Title of the Manuscript:	PFAS Binding Properties and Impact on Human Health: Physiochemical Properties, Impact of Multiple PFAS Compounds, Variation Among Species, and Fluoride Interaction.
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> This manuscript is very important to scientific community as PFAS contamination is a significant concern globally, and understanding their binding properties and impact on human health is crucial. If the manuscript presents new research findings, methodologies or data analysis approaches related to PFAS binding properties and human health impacts it can contribute to the scientific knowledge base. The title is suitable however the readers did not know what PFAS is. Suggestion to spelled it in full name. The structure of this manuscript is not appropriate. Literature review should be methodology section and the authors should explain what method used in order to review the this manuscript. This manuscript is scientifically report because it is review paper. The reference should be added more as this manuscript is reviu paper. Please avoid to use references that is backdated more than 10 years. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The english quality of this manuscript need to be improve. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Abstract;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> “Research has begun to help better understand these compounds and how they impact human health and the environment. While there is vast research surrounding these compounds, they have many different characteristics that make it difficult to understand their full impact.” Please rephrase this sentence. It looks like the same meaning. The abstract is lacking on the flow of review paper. The methods part is not included. The purpose of this manuscript should be after a brief of introduction. <p>Keyword; why kidney?</p> <p>Please check the entire guideline of the journal since it is not justify.</p> <p>Introduction;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> What is PFOA and PFOS. USEPA should be written in full name first. “water regulations of 0ppt” what is 0ppt? “performed a representative population study that determined there was an association between higher PFOA concentration and thyroid disease however, other studies came to a different conclusion (Melzer et al., 2010)” which studies that came to different conclusion? Because the author cited the same reference. “When looking at the impact of these compounds on the liver there are multiple studies that research not only the effect but the mode of how these chemicals cause damage (Fenton et al., 2021)” hanging statement. “Most of the research that has been done on PFAS have been done as single compound exposures which limits the knowledge researchers have on how these various compounds interact with one another.” Rephrase. 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>7. "One researcher observed PFAS" one researcher?</p> <p>8. "Another important aspect to consider when looking at the current research is how these animal studies translate to humans." What do you mean by this?</p> <p>9. Overall comment: introduction should be more specific; focus could be on the PFAS.</p> <p>Literature review;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. What is Kd2. "role in the sorption" check this.3. Should explain more on the figure. Lack of discussion.4. PCR, CD spectroscopy, MTT should be written in full name first.5. "Alesio et al., 2022" please check the format6. Please cite the manuscript properly. <p>Lack of discussion in this manuscript.</p> <p>The conclusion did not state the significance of this review study.</p>	
--	---	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nur Azalina Suzianti Feisal
Department, University & Country	Management and Science University, Malaysia