

# Review of: "Mental health in fishing communities: An overview of current knowledge and information gaps for fisheries"

Maria João Trigueiro<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Instituto Politécnico do Porto

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Although this is an interesting and undoubtedly little explored topic, the article seems to need a thorough revision because from the research question/objectives to the discussion, there seems to be a lack of a common thread that helps the reader understand not only what was intended but also how it was done and what results (that meet the objectives) were achieved. It seems that the author has tried to compile a series of studies into a single article, which I believe have contributed to a larger study but which, put in this way, make it very confusing to understand what she wants to convey.

The second paragraph of the introduction could have had more organised information instead of mixing background, risk factors and descriptions of prevalent symptoms throughout the paragraph.

In the 3rd paragraph, saying that there is "a significant proportion of the global human population being artisanal and commercial fishers" is an unclear statement because, according to data from the 2018 FAO report (Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations - <https://www.fao.org/3/ca0191en/ca0191en.pdf>), this proportion is less than 8%. I would advise revising the wording.

The research question (What is the state of knowledge on the mental health of fishers on a global scale?) doesn't seem to be in line with what the authors say when they say that "Thus, a review of the mental health of fishers may help determine the factors to explain the resilience and sustainability of fisheries". On the other hand, the objectives are to a) identify the breadth of mental health aspects in fisheries literature, b) establish the geographic focus of the fisheries mental health literature, and c) examine the factors responsible for the global disparity in fisheries mental health literature. I don't think it's clear to the reader whether the authors wanted to map fishermen's mental health or whether, as the research question and objectives 2 and 3 seem to suggest, they wanted to describe the state of the art of the literature on fishermen's mental health. It was very important to clarify this in order to understand the rest of the article.

Again, at the beginning of the methods chapter, the author says that "This research used a scoping review, a synthesis based approach to build new knowledge on the mental health of fishers from examination of existing literature", which suggests that the aim of the work will indeed be to describe the mental health of fishermen. Therefore, I think it is essential to review the objectives of the work and reformulate them in such a way that they leave the reader in no doubt.

In the Data Analysis chapter, the author doesn't explain how she arrived at the "main topics or thematic clusters for

discussion in this study", apart from the "frequency of recurrence" (she doesn't explain what: key words? themes?). She doesn't explain who carried out this analysis, how many researchers were involved or how consensus was reached. In other words, the methods used in the study are not explained.

Also in the selection of the studies that were included in the analysis, there is a lack of description of the methods used, namely, how the articles were analyzed, how they were selected from the initial 7000 to the 83 analyzed in the end, how many researchers made this selection, how they reached consensus...

The analysis of the geographical influence on the availability of mental health in fishers data and the importance of this analysis for the aim and purpose of a scoping review are not clear. In fact, it seems that the author used several methods in this study, including a scoping review, but I think that classifying this study as a scoping review is a mistake because it goes far beyond that.

The results are very poorly described, focusing only on the geographical distribution of the provenance of the studies found and completely escaping the theme of the scoping review. In the discussion chapter, the author describes the results of the studies and what was put in the discussion should, actually, be part of the results. So, it seems that the author didn't really describe the results in the "Results" chapter and didn't really discuss them in the "Discussion" chapter.

In the conclusion, the author refocuses on the geographical distribution of studies on the mental health of fishers and fails to answer her own research question (What is the state of knowledge on the mental health of fishers on a global scale?) or objective ( a) identify the breadth of mental health aspects in fisheries literature), focusing only on the following objectives ( b) establish the geographic focus of the fisheries mental health literature, and c) examine the factors responsible for the global disparity in fisheries mental health literature). On the other hand, the poor description of the methodology used makes it difficult to understand what was actually done, or to ensure that the procedures that should be taken into account in a scoping review were followed.

I believe that all the work developed by the author is of great merit and should be transmitted to the scientific community with the greatest rigor and clarity possible. Only in this way can it be recognized for its real value. Based on this, I would advise a comprehensive review of the article, starting with the study classification, which is either not a scoping review or needs to be restructured to show the methodology used, the description of the findings in the articles, and the corresponding discussion.