

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Emerging evidence on programs and policies for migrant and refugee youth's sexual and reproductive health and rights: A scoping review

Review, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Margaret Haworth-Brockman

Submitted on: 06 Mar 2023

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1605801

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main theme of the review.

This manuscript describes a scoping review examining literature on programs and policies specific to the sexual and reproductive health and rights of migrant and refugee youth.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

I found this paper quite challenging to read and it will be strengthened by some revisions.

Among the current strengths, the authors situate their review in relation to the UN Partners for Dignity and Rights (PFDAR) framework. The introduction would benefit from a more fulsome description of the framework and the components that are illustrated in Figure 1. The authors return to the framework in their discussion, and I recommend that the results section describing the themes emerging from the documents retrieved continue with examining alignment with the framework.

Limitations are more numerous and are described below.

Q 3 Please provide your detailed review report to the authors, structured in major and minor comments.

The paper would benefit from a definition of "migrant and refugee" from the outset. Although these are search terms used by the authors (and thus would retrieve papers also using the terms), the authors have not specified what it is about being a migrant (how long ago?) or refugee that creates a SRH issue to be studied. Some of the findings, for example, concern international students.

The opening sentence presents some circular reasoning: to paraphrase: Sexual and Reproductive Health Rights (SRHR) is (sic) a fundamental human right and central to ... youths' knowledge and agency because their knowledge and agency are not considered. And then the end of the sentence has "low-income countries" added in. Do the authors wish to address the lack of rights in home countries, or in the countries in which they have arrived? If the latter, then this needs to be made clearer.

I note that the information provided in the second paragraph is a mixture of evidence related to migrant and non-migrant young people, such as the reference from the CDC which does not provide data about migrants and refugees specifically.

Table 1 with the search terms has only Australia as a location for inclusion but there are no exclusions related to location.

Research Question C lacks specificity: What is meant by "significance of service" and "it's impact"? The question is too vague as written.

The methods section describes an assessment system for the retrieved papers, but other than presenting the grades in Table 2, what importance does the assessment have for the authors' findings?

Overall, the paper requires revisions to set up the research question(s) more clearly, and to follow through on the UN framework throughout. Many sentences are convoluted and require rewording. In at least one place, a news story has been used as an illustration, without information about why its details were given over other stories or evidence. How do the themes and findings the authors present relate to knowledge of SRH rights, as opposed to knowledge about SRH in general?

Finally, I recommend that the authors consider their choice of language carefully. All persons have "ethnic cultures"; some are the mainstream and dominant ones in a country, and others may be less well known.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

It would be beneficial to understand why or if the authors looked for non-peer review reports from grassroots or government agencies.

Q 5 Does this manuscript refer only to published data? (unpublished data is not allowed for Reviews)

Yes.

Q 6 Does the manuscript cover the issue in an objective and analytical manner

No.

Q 7 Was a review on the issue published in the past 12 months?

Yes.

Q 8 Does the review have international or global implications?

Per Question 7, I found this during a very cursory search:

<https://www.pacifichealthdialog.nz/index.php/phd/article/view/135> I don't know how the editors take this into consideration.

Per Question 8: it is difficult to assess the global implications of the manuscript as it is written. The paper would benefit from a conclusion that includes mention of the generalizability of their findings.

Q 9 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

No. The evidence for programs and policies for ensuring rights are known and understood is not always the focus of this manuscript

Q 10 Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes

Q 11 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes

Q 12 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

No.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 13 Quality of generalization and summary

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Q 14 Significance to the field

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Q 15 Interest to a general audience

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Q 16 Quality of the writing

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

REVISION LEVEL

Q 17 Please take a decision based on your comments:

Major revisions.