

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Emerging evidence on programs and policies for migrant and refugee youth's sexual and reproductive health and rights: A scoping review

Review, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Manuel García-Ramírez

Submitted on: 21 Mar 2023

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1605801

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main theme of the review.

The manuscript "Emerging evidence on programs and policies for migrant and refugee youth's sexual and reproductive health and rights. A scoping review" aims to map the sexual and reproductive health evidence of migrant youth. The authors adopt the principles of the Human Rights Assessment of the Medicare model to establish the strengths and weaknesses of the available knowledge through a scoping review. The main conclusion highlights the urgency of promoting initiatives that incorporate the perspectives of the refugee and migrant population in health protection systems and policies in order to offer accessible and quality services to all citizens.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

This manuscript addresses a topic of utmost interest for the health of migrant and refugee youth. Their sexual and reproductive rights are a key area for their health and the configuration of their human and social capital. The adoption of a human rights-based framework links health to its social determinants and distributive justice. The adoption of the scoping review methodology for the literature review can be useful in view of the limited number of innovations required to increase the impact of policies and interventions. The three thematic areas detected reflect the challenges faced by the population (i.e., limitations of sexual and reproductive health education; systemic discrimination, inequity and anonymity and privacy risks).

However, the study has important limitations and weaknesses: The conceptual justification is weak. The authors structure their proposal based on the NESRI model (Human Right assessment of the Medicare for All Act of 2019). More anchoring would be needed in conceptual proposals that have had an important international impact in the literature such as Stronk et al. (WHO, 2016; Social justice and human rights as a framework for addressing social determinants of health); Standards for Health Promoting Hospitals and Health Services led by the International Network of Health Promoting Hospitals; as well as the MIPEX Health strand (see, for example, Ingleby et al. (2019; Eur J Public Health Jun 1;29(3):458-462). The conceptual and methodological proposal of Reproductive Justice would allow enriching the adopted framework with a vision oriented to action and transfer.

These orientations would have made it possible to innovate in the criteria and search terms that would have enriched the results obtained. However, the results only show themes that pathologize and medicalize the knowledge on sexual and reproductive health of migrant and refugee youth. The authors acknowledge these weaknesses in the limitations section. However, they are limitations that extremely constrain the novelty of the paper; neither programs nor policies have been identified, nor have their evaluations and impacts been achieved.

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

The main comments have already been described in the previous boxes. I would like to emphasize that, although the manuscript aims to identify programs, policies and interventions, the searches carried out have not achieved this end and the analysis of the texts identified does not allow us to obtain these indicators.

PLEASE COMMENT

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

This is covered in previous responses. I would only like to add that the authors should present the references more appropriately by distinguishing those used in the review from those that have been used to justify, analyze and discuss it.

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

No.

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

Yes.

Q 8 Does the review have international or global implications?

This is a topic with internationally and globally important implications. Nevertheless, the authors should have made an effort to incorporate gray literature beyond what they have obtained in Australia. Migratory flows to Europe and America and the recent humanitarian crises generated by the pandemic and war conflicts cannot be left out of this type of review and it still be useful to the global community of reference researchers.

Q 9 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes

Q 10 Are the keywords appropriate?

They do not include that it is a review, nor that main target of the paper is to identify "programs and policies". "Agency" is included, which does not refer to a central topic of the manuscript.

Q 11 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

I am not qualified to answer this question

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

Yes.

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:

Major revisions.