

Review of: "Associations between direct contact with the oil and worsened health indicators after Deepwater Horizon oil spill: Results from Gulf States Population Survey"

Ayesha Azhar¹

¹ University of the Punjab

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

"Associations between Direct Contact with the Oil and Worsened Health Indicators after Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill" by Bingxue Han is a well-executed study that advances our understanding of the health consequences of oil spills. The study's reliance on a representative dataset, meticulous analysis, and thoughtful interpretation of results make it a valuable addition to the existing literature. The findings underscore the importance of considering mental and physical health outcomes in assessing the long-term effects of environmental disasters. This research has meaningful implications for public health policy and disaster response strategies.

Certainly, here are some potential areas where improvements or corrections could be made in the review:

1. Introduction Clarity:

Original: "The aim of the study was to examine the associations between direct contact with the oil (DCO) and health indicators among the adult residents in the 25 coastal counties or parishes most directly affected by the Deepwater Horizon oil spill (DHOS) in the Gulf of Mexico."

Suggested: "The study aimed to investigate the potential associations between direct contact with oil (DCO) and various health indicators among adult residents residing in the 25 coastal counties or parishes that were most severely impacted by the Deepwater Horizon oil spill (DHOS) in the Gulf of Mexico."

2. Methodology Precision:

Original: "Data were based on the Gulf States Population Survey (GSPS)."

Suggested: "The research utilized data from the Gulf States Population Survey (GSPS)."

3. Clarity in Findings:

Original: "Controlling for confounding variables, DCO was associated with higher odds of poor mental QoL (adjusted odds ratio [aOR]: 1.284; 95% confidence interval [CI]: 1.045-1.578; $p=.018$), poor SRMH (aOR=1.278; 95%CI: 1.021-1.601; $p=.033$), anxiety (aOR=1.680; 95%CI: 1.395-2.024; $p<.001$), depression (aOR=1.182; 95%CI: 0.977-1.430; $p=.086$), and suicidality (aOR=1.920; 95%CI: 1.411-2.614; $p<.001$) after DHOS."

Suggested: "After controlling for confounding variables, the study revealed that direct contact with oil (DCO) was linked to elevated odds of experiencing poor mental quality of life (adjusted odds ratio [aOR]: 1.284; 95% confidence interval [CI]:

1.045-1.578; $p=.018$), as well as a higher likelihood of poor self-rated mental health (aOR=1.278; 95%CI: 1.021-1.601; $p=.033$), anxiety (aOR=1.680; 95%CI: 1.395-2.024; $p<.001$), and suicidality (aOR=1.920; 95%CI: 1.411-2.614; $p<.001$) post the DHOS event."

4. Limitations Clarification:

Original: "The cross-sectional design is noted as a constraint on establishing causality."

Suggested: "It is acknowledged that the cross-sectional design of the study presents a limitation in establishing causal relationships."

5. Conclusion Clarity:

Original: "The empirical findings of this research presented the managerial implications in the field of environmental health."

Suggested: "The empirical findings of this research carry managerial implications within the environmental health realm."

6. Review Structure:

The review could benefit from a more structured layout, with clear sections for Introduction, Methodology, Findings, Discussion, Limitations, and Conclusion.

7. Grammar and Punctuation:

Ensure consistency in punctuation and use of abbreviations (e.g., "QoL" and "SRMH") throughout the review.

Remember, these suggestions are meant to enhance the clarity and coherence of the review. Please review them carefully and make adjustments according to the tone and style of your writing.