

Peer Review

Review of: "Managing Work Activities on the Horizon of 2040: Which Challenges for Occupational Safety and Health at Work? A Foresight Study"

Pierre Bérastégui¹

1. Prevention and Research Unit (PRU), European Agency for Safety and Health at Work (EU-OSHA), Bilbao, Spain

General comment:

Thank you for the very interesting read. The paper is informative and methodologically sound – although at times a little difficult to follow because of the many steps, elements, and stakeholders involved in the methodology. In this regard, some minor additions and changes to the structure could improve readability. In its current state, it is closer to a methodological paper than a research paper. The approach is explained in great detail; the findings section is missing; and the discussion focuses primarily on the strengths and limitations of the approach. I personally would have liked to have more insights into the findings of the last workshops, with a proper “Findings” section. That said, this is a very interesting piece as a methodological paper – but then maybe this could be made more explicit in the introduction and abstract.

Specific comments:

- While the concept of « activité » is central to the French school of ergonomics, I believe the translation of “work activities” or “activity” won’t speak to an international audience and could be – in most cases – simply replaced by “work”.
- Section 1 could maybe end by explaining the aim of the study, i.e., that it intends to forecast possible further evolutions in “work activity” management methods. This would bridge the theoretical part with the methodology more organically.
- The subtitle “Component 1...” should be in bold. The numbering of the subtitles is inconsistent (e.g., 1 instead of 2.1).

- In Table 4, the driver “Transformations sociétales” is duplicated in French and English.
- It would be useful to have a figure with the different steps of the methodology, the different stakeholders, as well as the different outputs, and how they relate to subsequent steps. Introducing this figure at the beginning of the methodological section may help the reader to follow through the section.
- “Travail réel” and “travail prescrit” are usually translated into “Work-as-Done” (WAD) and “Work-as-Imagined” (WAI).
- The transversal trend no. 2 could be further explained; how replacing management with automating instructions is widening the gap between WAD and WAI?
- Shouldn't 3.3. be the “Findings” section of the paper?
- Section 4.5 could be moved from the discussion to the newly created Findings section.
- There is no section 4.4.
- The discussion section could be a bit more detailed and organized around the typical sections of strengths and limitations, implications, and further research.
- A more prominent place could be given to the discussion of the practical implications of this exercise. How can it inform, guide, and prepare for the prevention of emerging risks for OSH?
- Finally, I bring forward the comment of a fellow OSH expert who read the paper with great interest: “They seem to assume that in 2040 responsibility for OSH will still depend on the contract of employment. I think they should consider the possibility of a shift to the model in place in Australia and New Zealand where the responsibility falls not on the employer, but on the ‘person conducting a business or undertaking’ (PCBU)”.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.