

# Review of: "An approach to the background, methods and challenges of research in disasters"

Lotta Velin<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Linköping University

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this piece. It is an interesting read and provides a good overview of disaster-related research. My main issue with this article is the lack of clarity regarding the type of article it is and what its' aim is. Is it a viewpoint or a literature review? I understand the intention of this paper to act as a form of scoping review - is that right? If the intention is to be more of a viewpoint piece, I think this can be clarified and then, you could restructure it and not have a "methods" and "results" section. If it is a review paper, a clear aim should be stated and a more detailed methods section should be considered. The claims and conclusions drawn are not clearly supported by the results in the paper, likely due to the lack of transparency regarding the search and analysis processes.

Some detailed comments follow below:

- **Methods:** The methods are very brief. If the intention is to be a review article (even if it is a narrative review or scoping review), I think it would be helpful to readers to be more transparent and precise in the methods section. Some questions that I think should be addressed:
  - How did you conduct your search? Was there a search strategy? Which databases were searched?
  - How did you select articles? Inclusion/exclusion criteria? Abstract-level screening? One or multiple reviewers?
  - Which metrics did you collect? How were they analyzed?
- **Results**
  - Table 1 - the first column title is in Spanish. Reword to english? Also, which pre-existing model are you basing your table on? Would be helpful to add a reference.
  - You make a statement that "From the point of view of the type of research design used, almost all the traditional available types of epidemiological signs are currently used in present disaster research, from descriptive observational designs...." How do you support this claim? it is not clear if this has emerged from your analysis or if this is backed up in other literature? If it is more of a "hunch"/personal opinion, you should consider rewording this to make it a bit "softer" and perhaps move it to the discussion since it is not actually the results of an analysis.