

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Occupational factors affecting women workers' sexual and reproductive health outcomes in Oil, Gas and Mining Industry: A scoping review

Review, Public Health Rev

Reviewer: Vivi Schlunssen

Submitted on: 17 Feb 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/phrs.2022.1604653

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main theme of the review.

Scoping review on Occupational factors affecting women workers' sexual and reproductive health outcomes in Oil, Gas and Mining Industries

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Strength: A comprehensive well conducted scoping review

limitations: there is no quality evaluation of the body of evidence in this scoping review. While this is fully acceptable, it also limits the interpretation of data, and calls for cautious conclusion. In general, I think the interpretation and conclusion is to firm. I therefore advise the authors to read the manuscript and adjust the text to more cautious interpretations and conclusions

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

Overall comments

This scoping review on Occupational factors affecting women workers' sexual and reproductive health outcomes in Oil, Gas and Mining Industries is timely, important, well conducted and well written
Still, there is a couple of comments and questions

As stated in the review (e.g. page 3 line 117 - 119) there is no quality evaluation of the body of evidence in this scoping review. While this is fully acceptable, it also limits the interpretation of data, and calls for cautious conclusion. In general, I think the interpretation and conclusion is to firm (please see some examples below). I therefore advise the authors to read the manuscript and adjust the text to more cautious interpretations and conclusions

Specific comments:

Abstracts, page 1 line 12 .14. The method description is very brief. Please mention the used methodology (Joanna Briggs/PRISMA) and a few more details about the process

Page 3, line 117-118. I do not think the aim can be to "comprehensively understand" - the aim is to review the current evidence/map the literature.

Page 3, line 122-123: In my opinion the scoping review is primarily to identify gaps / research needs. I do not think the scoping review can justify already now to "recommend various Organisation to "holistically promote sexual and reproductive health among working women in OGH industries".

Page 7, line 1- 2. This is an example, where the conclusion in my opinion is to firm: ".....the findings show that chemical and physical factors were the greatest occupational influencers of sexual and reproductive health among women workers... ". Given that no evaluation of the quality of studies is provided, I would phrase it more cautious.

Page 8, line 354–355. Another example where the conclusion in my opinion is to firm” “The findings of this scoping review suggest a pressing need to adjust the working place, conditions, facilities, and practices for female workers”.

Page 9, line 414 – 420: In this section, more very concrete initiatives on the workplaces are suggested. Can this be justified based on this scoping review, or is more research needed in order to tailor preventive initiatives?

Page 9, line 427 – 435: I think the major limitation is the missing evaluation of the quality of the included studies. Moreover, this is not just a matter of accuracy, but also validity of the findings. This should be stated more clearly in the limitation section.

Specific comments, minor

Page 1. Line 30: Please change to:industry is one of the most hazardous..... There is more examples of similar issues in the manuscript – so please go carefully through the text once more to correct language issues.

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)

No.

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?

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?

Mostly - a few minor issues

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

No.

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.