Qeios

Peer Review

Review of: "Environmental Health Risks, Community Experiences, and Healthcare Access in Oil-Producing Low- and Middle-Income countries: A Scoping Review Protocol"

S.B. Aher[1]

1. Independent researcher

MAJOR COMMENTS

- The scope of the review is excessively broad, covering environmental health risks, health outcomes, lived experiences, healthcare access, governance responses, methodological approaches, and theoretical frameworks simultaneously. So, refine and narrow the conceptual scope of the review or provide a stronger integrative conceptual framework linking all domains.
- Key concepts such as “environmental health risks,” “lived experiences,” “healthcare access,” and “oil-polluted localities” are insufficiently operationalised. Thus, provide clear operational definitions and specify how these concepts will be applied during screening and data extraction.
- The rationale for restricting the review to LMICs is not sufficiently justified. Strengthen the justification for excluding high-income settings and clarify how LMIC classification will be determined.
- The search strategy appears underdeveloped for a review of this complexity and may fail to capture relevant literature. So, expand search terminology, incorporate additional synonyms and indexing terms, and consider consultation with an information specialist or librarian.
- Single-reviewer screening and extraction may introduce selection and interpretation bias. Consider dual independent screening for at least full-text review and partial duplicate data extraction to strengthen methodological rigour.

doi.org/10.32388/F2S4I6

- The policy analysis and political economy component is insufficiently described and lacks methodological clarity. Hence, clearly specify the analytical framework, inclusion criteria for policy documents, and planned approach for stakeholder and political economy analysis.
- The grey literature strategy lacks transparency and reproducibility. So, clarify grey literature search procedures, document selection criteria, stopping rules, and methods for assessing relevance and credibility.
- The research questions are overlapping and overly expansive. Streamline and align the primary and sub-research questions more closely with the stated review objectives and planned synthesis.
- The proposed synthesis approach remains vague. Thus, provide a more detailed analytical plan, including how qualitative, quantitative, and policy evidence will be synthesised and compared across regions.
- The protocol does not indicate whether it will be prospectively registered. Clarify whether the protocol will be registered on an appropriate platform such as OSF or INPLASY.
- Restricting inclusion to English-language literature may introduce substantial regional bias. So, provide a stronger discussion of the implications of language bias, particularly regarding evidence from Latin America, Francophone Africa, and Lusophone regions.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.