

Peer Review

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

Hanna Jardel¹

1. National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, United States

This is an important and ambitious project. There are a few things that could improve it.

1. abstract

- a. typo – "...contaminated water and report..."
- b. typo – "...barriers to ~~health~~ healthcare access..."

2. introduction

- a. paragraph 2 – It wasn't clear that the first part of the paragraph was all about the Niger Delta until you used Latin America as a comparison. That should be a bit clearer
- b. paragraph 2 – There are a few times that you reference "social exclusion" throughout this paper, but it's unclear what you mean by this or why this would be related to oil activity. Could you perhaps give specific examples or references to clarify what 'social exclusion' means and how it would be related to oil activity?
- c. paragraph 8 – "Oil-producing areas (?) ~~regions~~ across both regions frequently..."
- d. paragraph 8 – Please be a bit more descriptive about how distrust of oil firms and incomplete remediation after oil spills shape how residents perceive risk and respond to illness. For instance, are they more or less likely to perceive high risk or to seek care for illness, and why would that be?

3. Research question

- a. sub questions 4 typo – "... interventions, or policy responses..."

4. Eligibility criteria

a. context

- i. Please describe how you define low- and middle-income countries. Is there a list that you reference?

b. exclusion criteria

- i. Why is it that you would exclude occupational exposures among offshore workers? They could experience similar exposures as those living in communities (in terms of chemicals/agents, duration, concentrations, and frequency). It could give you an idea of potential health outcomes to watch out for in communities, even if not actual health effects documented in communities.

c. search strategy

- i. Might want to provide a search strategy for all of the databases unless there are several that are exactly the same

d. Study

- i. Please have in place a process by which all AI-assisted suggestions will be reviewed by a human

e. Assessment of methodological quality

- i. typo – “As scoping reviews are distinct from...”

5. Appendix 1

a. search string

- i. You might want to include “ethnography” in your clause for lived experience
- ii. Your clause for healthcare access seems more like it should not be an “AND” statement, given your research questions. The way I understood your questions, you would be interested in impacts of oil activity that include health conditions even if they don’t include healthcare access, correct? I think you’d benefit from thinking more about your search strategy and if you need multiple to answer all of your questions.

b. data extraction form

- i. In Study Design/Methodology, you list both “grey literature” and “PhD thesis,” but these describe the type of literature (for example, a PhD thesis could use qualitative or quantitative methods).

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.