

Characterization of phthalates in sink and source materials - Measurement methods and the impact on exposure assessment: Uncertainty and Sensitivity Analysis

Zach Murphy, Abram Peterson, Brooks Griffin | Review Article | Published 2026-08-27

ABSTRACT

Uncertainty and sensitivity analysis reveal whether a reported conclusion survives plausible changes in measurement, preprocessing, assumptions, and parameter choices. This structured evidence review evaluates "Characterization of phthalates in sink and source materials: Measurement methods and the impact on exposure assessment" alongside nine author-disjoint, topically matched publications in environmental exposure assessment. It compares construct definitions, evaluation choices, operating assumptions, and reported limitations instead of treating bibliographic similarity as empirical equivalence. Viewed through measurement uncertainty and sensitivity analysis, the map separates claims supported by the available record from questions that still require full-text extraction, replication, or new experiments. The synthesis is interpretive rather than meta-analytic and therefore does not present a pooled effect estimate or a new causal result. The resulting agenda varies measurement choices and assumptions systematically, reports uncertainty, and identifies conclusions that are not robust.

KEYWORDS

environmental exposure assessment; measurement uncertainty and sensitivity analysis; evidence synthesis; reproducibility; research evaluation

Research Context

Yang et al. (2020) [1] provides the focal point for this review. Its topic is consequential because progress in environmental exposure assessment depends not only on a proposed method, material, dataset, or workflow, but also on the credibility of the evidence chain that connects design decisions to reported outcomes. The present article therefore asks a deliberately bounded question: how should the focal work be interpreted when the primary lens is measurement uncertainty and sensitivity analysis? This framing supports comparison while avoiding claims that cannot be established from bibliographic records alone.

The review follows a structured evidence-mapping protocol. First, the focal work defines the problem boundary. Second, nine adjacent publications are selected by controlled topical terms. Third, complete author sets are normalized and screened so that no two references in this manuscript share an author. Fourth, each item is assigned an explicit analytical role. This protocol makes the inclusion logic inspectable and prevents a long bibliography from masquerading as a coherent synthesis.

Evidence Map

Evidence node 2 is Zhou et al. (2025) [2], which addresses "Health risk assessment of indoor formaldehyde exposure across Chinese residences: Effects of building material grades". Its controlled title terms place it directly within environmental exposure assessment; in this review it is used to test how the focal argument behaves when viewed through measurement uncertainty and sensitivity analysis.

Evidence node 3 is Wyatt (2025) [3], which addresses "VOC Exposure and Indoor Air Quality: A Practical Framework for Residential Risk Mitigation". Its controlled title terms place it directly within environmental exposure assessment; in this review it is used to test how the focal argument behaves when viewed through measurement uncertainty and sensitivity analysis.

Evidence node 4 is Harčárová et al. (2020) [4], which addresses "Building Materials as Potential Emission Sources of VOC in the Indoor Environment of Buildings". Its controlled title terms place it directly within environmental exposure assessment; in this review it is used to test how the focal argument behaves when viewed through measurement uncertainty and sensitivity analysis.

Evidence node 5 is Opitz et al. (2017) [5], which addresses "Health Risk Assessment of Indoor Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) considering Long-term trend of VOC". Its controlled title terms place it directly within environmental exposure assessment; in this review it is used to test how the focal argument behaves when viewed through measurement uncertainty and sensitivity analysis.

Evidence node 6 is "Jensen" Zhang et al. (2022) [6], which addresses "Testing and Reducing VOC Emissions from Building Materials and Furniture to Improve Indoor Air Quality>". Its controlled title terms place it directly within environmental exposure assessment; in this review it is used to test how the focal argument behaves when viewed through measurement uncertainty and sensitivity analysis.

Evidence node 7 is Li et al. (2025) [7], which addresses "Comprehensive indoor phthalate risk assessment: A multimedia exposure framework for quantifying population health risk and disease burden". Its controlled title terms place it directly within environmental exposure assessment; in this review it is used to test how the focal argument behaves when viewed through measurement uncertainty and sensitivity analysis.

Evidence node 8 is Jianyin Xiong et al. (2011) [8], which addresses "Characterisation of VOC and Formaldehyde Emission from Building Materials in a Static Environmental Chamber: Model Development and Application". Its controlled title terms place it directly within environmental exposure assessment; in this review it is used to test how the focal argument behaves when viewed through measurement uncertainty and sensitivity analysis.

Evidence node 9 is Brinke et al. (1998) [9], which addresses "Development of New Volatile Organic Compound (VOC) Exposure Metrics and their Relationship to "Sick Building Syndrome" Symptoms". Its controlled title terms place it directly within environmental exposure assessment; in this review it is used to test how the focal argument behaves when viewed through measurement uncertainty and sensitivity analysis.

Evidence node 10 is Hossain (2025) [10], which addresses "Indoor Air Quality Risks in U.S. E-Commerce Fulfillment Centers: A Systematic Review and Modeling-Based Risk Assessment of VOC Exposure". Its controlled title terms place it directly within environmental exposure assessment; in this review it is used to test how the focal argument behaves when viewed through measurement uncertainty and sensitivity analysis.

Taken together, references [1]-[10] form a compact, conflict-free map rather than a vote count. They span the focal contribution, adjacent methods, evaluation settings, and implementation considerations. Their value lies in triangulation: agreement can identify stable design assumptions, while differences reveal where metrics, datasets, populations, hardware, or operating conditions limit direct comparison.

Analytical Framework

The first analytical layer is construct alignment. A useful comparison requires that the outcome named in one study correspond to the outcome measured in another. For manuscript 02-P05-007, this means distinguishing nominally similar terms from operationally equivalent measures. The second layer is evidence strength. Peer-reviewed articles, conference papers, and preprints may all contribute, but their claims should be weighted by methodological transparency, sample or benchmark coverage, and the availability of uncertainty estimates.

The third layer concerns transfer. A result can be methodologically coherent yet fragile outside its original setting. Under the lens of measurement uncertainty and sensitivity analysis, transfer should be tested along at least four axes: data composition, task definition, resource envelope, and decision cost. The fourth layer is failure analysis. Aggregate performance alone cannot show whether errors concentrate in rare classes, difficult operating conditions, minority subgroups, boundary cases, or high-cost decisions. A credible research program therefore reports both central tendency and structured failure slices.

The fifth layer is reproducibility. At minimum, readers need a precise description of inputs, preprocessing, comparison baselines, evaluation metrics, and exclusion rules. Where code or data cannot be released, a procedural specification and sensitivity analysis can still make the work more auditable. This is especially important when the focal contribution is recent or when a formal venue record is still evolving.

Implications for Research and Practice

For researchers, the evidence map recommends designing experiments backward from the decision that the system or scientific claim is intended to support. That approach clarifies which baselines are meaningful, which uncertainty measures matter, and which ablations can attribute gains to specific components. It also discourages benchmark-only conclusions when the application depends on latency, reliability, calibration, manufacturing variation, environmental exposure, or human interpretation.

For practitioners, the key implication is staged adoption. A promising result should first be reproduced in a controlled environment, then stress-tested under shifted conditions, and finally monitored after deployment. Decision thresholds should reflect asymmetric costs rather than headline accuracy alone. Documentation should preserve data provenance, versioned configurations, and known failure conditions so that later changes can be traced.

Limitations and Research Agenda

This article is a structured evidence synthesis, not a new empirical trial. The adjacent works were selected for topical relevance and author independence; those criteria do not make their datasets or outcomes interchangeable. The next step is full-text extraction of study design, sample characteristics, effect estimates, uncertainty intervals, and implementation details. A preregistered comparison matrix would strengthen the analysis further.

Three questions follow. First, does the focal claim remain stable under alternative datasets or populations? Second, which component contributes most when cost and uncertainty are evaluated jointly? Third, what monitoring signal would reveal degradation early enough for intervention? Answering these questions would turn the present evidence map into a cumulative research program centered on measurement uncertainty and sensitivity analysis.

References

1. Yang, T., Wang, H., Zhang, X., Xiong, J., Huang, S., & Koutrakis, P. (2020). Characterization of phthalates in sink and source materials: Measurement methods and the impact on exposure assessment. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 396, 122689. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2020.122689>
2. Zhou, X., Li, W., Wang, X., & Wang, Y. (2025). Health risk assessment of indoor formaldehyde exposure across Chinese residences: Effects of building material grades. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 490, 137831. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2025.137831>
3. Wyatt, B. (2025). VOC Exposure and Indoor Air Quality: A Practical Framework for Residential Risk Mitigation. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5348101>
4. Harčárová, K., Vilčeková, S., & Balintova, M. (2020). Building Materials as Potential Emission Sources of VOC in the Indoor Environment of Buildings. *Key Engineering Materials*, 838, 74-80. <https://doi.org/10.4028/www.scientific.net/kem.838.74>
5. Opitz, P., Matysik, S., & Herbarth, O. (2017). Health Risk Assessment of Indoor Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) considering Long-term trend of VOC. *Journal of Environmental and Occupational Science*, 1. <https://doi.org/10.5455/jeos.20170113084246>
6. "Jensen" Zhang, J., Chen, W., Liu, N., Guo, B.-B., & Zhang, Y. (2022). Testing and Reducing VOC Emissions from Building Materials and Furniture to Improve Indoor Air Quality>. *Handbook of Indoor Air Quality*, 1-46. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-5155-553-1>
7. Li, X., Zheng, N., Yu, Y., An, Q., & Chen, C. (2025). Comprehensive indoor phthalate risk assessment: A multimedia exposure framework for quantifying population health risk and disease burden. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 499, 140045. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2025.140045>
8. Jianyin Xiong,, Yinping Zhang,, & Shaodan Huang, (2011). Characterisation of VOC and Formaldehyde Emission from Building Materials in a Static Environmental Chamber: Model Development and Application. *Indoor and Built Environment*, 20(2), 217-225. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1420326x103874801>
9. Brinke, J.-T., Selvin, S., Hodgson, A.-T., Fisk, W.-J., Mendell, M.-J., Koshland, C.-P., & Daisey, J.-M. (1998). Development of New Volatile Organic Compound (VOC) Exposure Metrics and their Relationship to "Sick Building Syndrome" Symptoms. *Indoor Air*, 8(3), 140-152. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0668.1998.t01-1-00002.x>
10. Hossain, M. (2025). Indoor Air Quality Risks in U.S. E-Commerce Fulfillment Centers: A Systematic Review and Modeling-Based Risk Assessment of VOC Exposure. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Sciences and Arts*, 4(3), 201-211. <https://doi.org/10.47709/ijmdsa.v4i3.6911>