

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Risk factors for working pregnant women and potential adverse consequences of exposure: a systematic review

Review, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Wojciech Hanke

Submitted on: 22 Dec 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1605655

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main theme of the review.

The manuscript is done according to current systematic review criteria. The information is well-selected and provides an overview of current knowledge in the field of occupational reproductive epidemiology.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Limitations – some statements need to be rewritten

Strengths – up-to-date review prepared by authors with good backgrounds,

Q 3 Please provide your detailed review report to the authors, structured in major and minor comments.

The manuscript is done according to current systematic review criteria. The information is well-selected and provides an overview of current knowledge in the field of occupational reproductive epidemiology.

Some minor remarks:

Line 53 “hard physical work” – the term heavy physical work is in use

Line 65–66 “there are still some occupations that pose a certain risk” – provide clear information about what type of occupations are of concern.

Line 132 – “gestational complications” – indicate please what type of complications.

Line 135 as well as line 198 – “occupational factor” – not the clear term – maybe sector of employment would be more informative?

Line 204 “According to the results analyzed, women working in the service sector have a 36% higher frequency of low birth weight at term, and housewives, farmers, and manual workers have a 30% higher frequency of low birth weight at term – avoid repetition

Lines 206–209 “A year later, in 2010, Rosales–Aujang found that working activity was not confirmed as a relevant risk in terms of birth weight and gestational age.[25] There were significant differences with respect to threatened miscarriage (11.6% and 3.9%), cervicovaginitis (5.1% and 1.3%), and foetal distress (10.3% and 3.9%) for the group of working women, compared to non-working women”. First and second sentences are not in agreement.

Lines 213–215 “The authors concluded that those women in the business and management sector and those in professions related to teaching, health care, legal, and social services had a significantly higher risk (48%–63%) than housewives” – some commentary is needed to explain the findings in this study. The age as confounder might be a factor,

Line 242 “vaginal withdrawal” – what exactly was a problem?

Line 244 “alterations in the maternal immune function” – as above

Lines 271–273 “Knowledge of these data allows stating that more studies are needed to provide data on such associations found, being necessary to continue to deepen through a much more complex evaluation of the subject and an evaluation that allows determining the needs for intervention in each case” – not clear what exactly should be done? To whom the message is addressed?

Lines 294–295 – “The results of the present review suggest that no special protection measures are being applied to pregnant women in the workplace”. It is a very general statement. Please indicate what is the problem and who should solve it?

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

yes

Q 5 Does this manuscript refer only to published data? (unpublished data is not allowed for Reviews)

Yes.

Q 6 Does the manuscript cover the issue in an objective and analytical manner

Yes.

Q 7 Was a review on the issue published in the past 12 months?

No.

Q 8 Does the review have international or global implications?

yes

Q 9 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

yes

Q 10 Are the keywords appropriate?

yes

Q 11 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

could be improved

Q 12 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Not Applicable.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 13 Quality of generalization and summary



Q 14 Significance to the field



Q 15 Interest to a general audience



Q 16 Quality of the writing



REVISION LEVEL

Q 17 Please take a decision based on your comments:

Minor revisions.