

Review of: "Impact of Men's Labour Migration on Non-migrating Spouses' Health: A Systematic Review"

Luca Giuseppe Re¹

¹ University of Milan

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I thank the Editor for the opportunity to review this interesting manuscript

I would also like to thank the Authors for dealing with this topic, which is original and little dealt with but very important for all those who deal with migration policies at a global level

However, in my opinion the manuscript needs some major revisions, which may help to improve its quality and methodological coherence

Introduction

The title shows the characteristics of a scoping review (PCC - Population, Concept, Context) as opposed to those of a systematic review (PICOS - Patient, Intervention/Exposition, Comparison, Outcome, Study design)

Your objective is also broad and exploratory in nature, typical of a scoping review

I would therefore advise you to change the name of the study from 'systematic review' to 'scoping review'

Methods

I would advise the authors to adopt, for the characteristics of their review, the PRISMA -ScR checklist (<https://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/prisma-scr/>) specifically for scoping reviews

I would also recommend, as per JBI guidance, the development of a scoping review protocol (<https://jbi.global/scoping-review-network/resources#https://jbi.global/scoping-review-network/resources#>) and its registration on Open Science Framework (<https://osf.io/>)

Screening and selection

You have stated that you only consider papers published since 2005; could you please specify the rationale behind the chosen time limit?

Quality assessment

You performed a critical appraisal of the studies included in the review, but in the Results section you do not explain the outcomes of this appraisal, and in the Discussion section you do not implement a grading of recommendations according

to critical appraisal outcomes

In addition, you decided to exclude five studies because they were of low methodological quality, but you did not specify which characteristics (and their impact in relation to the topic under review) made you opt for exclusion

In my opinion, you could remove the quality assessment (you carried it out but did not use it) by staying within the confines of the indications of a scoping review (which does not provide for a quality assessment, except in exceptional and justified cases)