

Review of: "Human health effects of volcanic eruptions – a systematic review"

Majid Kermani¹

¹ Iran University of Medical Sciences

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

-In the introduction section, explain more about the innovative this paper.

-In the material and methods section, It is better to add the search strategy for all the investigated databases at the end of the article as a supplementary file.

-In the quality assessment section, the tool used for assessment is not described in detail, making it difficult to understand how the quality of the articles was evaluated. It is unclear what specific criteria were used to evaluate the articles.

-What is meant by "supplementary records" in the flowchart? Specify the number of articles in each of the databases in the flowchart or in the text.

-In the result section, articles published in 1982 and later are mentioned, while in the materials and methods section, it is mentioned that articles published in 2021 and 2022 were reviewed. Please clarify.

-Reference content should be added. And the analysis related to the type of study should be added.

-It is better to mention that the majority of studies on short-term human health effects focused on volcanoes in the USA and Iceland, with only a few studies conducted in other countries. This limited geographical coverage may not provide a comprehensive understanding of the global impact of volcanic eruptions on human health.

-Do the articles describe the distance at which populations can be affected by volcanic eruptions? If mentioned, add it.

-Check the numbers in the text (abstract and findings) again. For example, the number of respiratory diseases seems to be wrongly included in the abstract and results.

-The discussion section is a summary; explanations and articles related to this topic should be explained more. For example, the following should be mentioned in the discussion section: limited inclusion criteria, leading to the exclusion of potentially relevant articles. Potential bias in the quality evaluation process.

-The strength of this study should also be mentioned in this section.