

PFAS Causation: What Current Scientific Evaluations Suggest About Alleged Health Effects

By **Brian D. Gross** | **Max Swetman** | **Mikaela Barbour**

December 16, 2025

In an article for *Mealey's Emerging Toxic Torts*, MG+M The Law Firm Partners [Brian Gross](#) and [Max Swetman](#), along with Associate [Mikaela Barbour](#), analyze current scientific evaluations addressing alleged health effects associated with per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS), including PFOA and PFOS.

Courts, regulators, and public health agencies increasingly face claims linking PFAS exposure to a wide range of alleged health conditions. The article examines how evolving epidemiological research and public health guidance challenge many asserted theories of general causation, noting that most claimed PFAS-related health effects lack the consistency, reproducibility, and methodological rigor typically required to establish causation.

The authors place continued reliance on the C8 Science Panel's "probable link" findings in historical and scientific context, explaining that those determinations arose from litigation-specific standards and exposure conditions distinct from modern causation analysis. The article also reviews recent studies addressing kidney cancer and thyroid disease, highlighting mixed findings, methodological limitations, and a lack of consensus across the broader scientific literature.

In addition, the article discusses guidance from agencies such as the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, which cautions that reported associations do not equate to established causal relationships. The authors conclude by exploring implications for PFAS litigation, including the role of Rule 702 challenges, the application of Bradford Hill criteria, and the importance of monitoring ongoing scientific developments as courts evaluate causation evidence.

Read the [full article](#).