

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Methods matter: A comparative review of health risk assessments for ambient air pollution in Switzerland

Review, Public Health Rev

Reviewer: Gabriel Gulis

Submitted on: 15 Sep 2021

Article DOI: 10.3389/phrs.2022.1604431

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main theme of the review.

The manuscript evaluates impacts of air pollution on health comparing different methods of analysis.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

The strength of the manuscript is that it adds to existing knowledge on relation of air pollution and health. Limitation is in use of terminology, which I explain in next part.

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

A major issue is the use of term and acronym "health impact assessment – HIA". I believe the manuscript does not cover the formal definition of HIA as presented by Gothenburg Consensus paper. If authors want to use this term, they should provide their definition of HIA. I would however rather recommend to use either the term risk assessment, or risk appraisal as those are closer to the subject of the manuscript. HIA is much more complex methodology which includes risk assessment and risk appraisal.

A second issue, closely linked to the previous one is the linkage to GBD study. I am bit confused whether this manuscript aims to contribute to further development of the GBD study on field or air pollution as risk factor or what exactly is the aim? This needs to be clarified and consistently followed in text. For example the third sentence in Introduction starting "In some cases, HIAs are included in burden of disease (BoD calculations)..." is not true, or author misunderstood some issues. HIA occasionally use GBD outcomes to quantify the impact of policies, projects, programs on health, but they are not part of BoD calculations.

PLEASE COMMENT

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

If authors change the terminology as outlined above then yes. If they want to keep HIA in manuscript, they have to provide a reference to appropriate definition of HIA.

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 (unpublished data is not allowed for Reviews)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, it does

Q 9 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes, but the use of term "health impact assessment" is not justified by content

Q 10 Are the keywords appropriate?

except keyword "health impact assessment" yes

Q 11 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

yes

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.