

Review of: "Human health effects of volcanic eruptions – a systematic review"

Joana Duarte¹

¹ Universidade do Porto

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Systematic Reviews performed under the PRISMA guidelines should carefully address each checklist topic. The reference to PRISMA-P is not the most suited option as it reports to the research protocol (proposal) rather than to the review per se (research results). The most updated version of PRISMA should be used (Page et al., 2021). Scientific papers should not be developed in the first person.

The manuscript abstract works as the “business card.” Thus, it should be completed to reflect the paper's content.

The introduction thoroughly contextualizes volcano dynamics but needs to show the importance of studying the related health effects.

The 12-item assessment methodology referenced as [11] is not a usable tool. Maybe it was a misplaced reference?

The numbering (references presentation) could be more precise in the results, making understanding the found studies more difficult.

A bias analysis is missing from the manuscript, though it is reported that “a tool was used.” This information is essential in the information assessment. The study limitations are also missing from the manuscript, hindering interpretation and results’ relevance.

The conclusions do not reflect the desired outcomes stated in the manuscript beginning.

Nonetheless, it was a straightforward reading piece with lots of essential data on volcano eruption health effects. Fifty-seven included papers is quite an impressive number!