

Review of: "A systematic review and meta-analysis on international studies of prevalence, mortality and survival due to coal mine dust lung disease"

Liliane Teixeira¹

¹ Fundação Oswaldo Cruz

Potential competing interests: The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

The article is very interesting and there are just a few considerations in the method.

According to PRISMA, Systematic Review should only be initiated after registration of the protocol. As the authors did not do this, I suggest that the differences between the protocol design and the completed project be discussed in the article.

There are items that must be entered:

- Description of the risk factor. Also, how the risk factor may impact the outcome?
- Logic model of the possible causal relationship between occupational exposure to coal mine dust and lung diseases.
- Inherent bias of the data sources.

It seems that there was no searching gray literature, Internet search engines and Organizational websites (such as work of the ministry of the countries with the highest coal production).

It is also not informed if the Requested missing data was performed.

Are there systematic reviews on the topic? If so, these reviews should have been cited and the differences between them and the protocol should be clarified.

As no systematic reviews on the subject were found, the search strategy should have incorporated a longer period, as well as articles written in other languages, as the largest coal mines are also found in Russia, China and India.