

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| TITLE (PROVISIONAL) | EXPERT CONSENSUS ON A PROTOCOL FOR CONDUCTING BIBLIOMETRIC ANALYSIS OF SCIENTIFIC ARTICLES ON GLOBAL MIGRATION HEALTH (GMH) |
| AUTHORS | Pernitez-Agan, Sweetmavourneen; Bautista, Mary Ann; Lopez, Janice; Sampson, Margaret; Kapilashrami, Anuj; Garabiles, Melissa; Hui, Charles; Babu, Bontha; Aziz, Roomi; Jordan, Lucy P.; Mondres, Teddy Rowell U.; Lebanan, May Antonnette; Wickramage, Kolitha Editorial Board Member; Collaborator, Manila Consensus Group |

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| REVIEWER | Diaz, Esperanza University of Bergen, Department of Global Public Health and Primary Care |
| REVIEW RETURNED | 22-Nov-2023 |

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| GENERAL COMMENTS | <p>Thank you very much for letting me review this protocol: EXPERT CONSENSUS ON A PROTOCOL FOR CONDUCTING BIBLIOMETRIC ANALYSIS OF SCIENTIFIC ARTICLES ON GLOBAL MIGRATION HEALTH (GMH)</p> <p>The paper is well written and clear, and protocols like this can help advance research in the field. I have however some comments that I would like the authors to address.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. It is not completely clear if this protocol is meant to be a tool for the region or meant to be globally applicable. And will a follow up be considered in the future? (see point 5 too)2. Since you have a box to explain the term "migrant", please try to avoid long explanations of who you include repeated along the manuscript. It makes the reading difficult. Better to refer to the box, and eventually reorganise the terms there in a hierarchical way?3. In comparison with the elaboration of "migrant", the term "health" is barely defined, and it is not clear to what extent terms like mental health or occupational health will be covered. Please elaborate a little more.4. In the lists of terms, I would like to see "use of interpreters/language" and "Primary health care", since these are two key themes related to the health of migrants.5. Following the recently research agenda published by WHO (October 2023), I think themes as multidisciplinary and co-production should be part of the systematic IA-driven search, in order to be able to see if these key issues are incorporated in research. |
|-------------------------|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| | 6. Actually, I suggest the authors discuss to which degree the protocol will facilitate the evaluation of the evolution of this WHO recommendations in the future. |
|--|--|

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| REVIEWER | Sedeta, Ephrem Addis Ababa University College of Health Sciences |
| REVIEW RETURNED | 04-Jan-2024 |

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| GENERAL COMMENTS | <p>Comments to the Author</p> <p>Pernitez-Agan and colleagues have utilized a systematic search strategy using Scopus to map scientific articles on global migration health. This can be important for identifying trends and patterns in research output over time, mapping the research landscape, identifying research gaps, and informing policy and practice in global migration health.</p> <p>My comments are below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Justify the choice of database: A specific database is often driven by the researcher's goals and the nature of the research question. However, this choice inherently introduces a level of subjectivity and can influence the analysis outcomes. The manuscript should provide a rationale for selecting a specific electronic database for the literature search. Please explain why a certain database was chosen and whether any potential sources of bias were considered. • Articles about brain drain and migrant nurses, physicians, or health professions were excluded. Is there any specific reason why this was excluded from this study and the previous study by Sweileh et. al.? • Quality vs. Quantity: Bibliometric analyses typically focus on quantitative measures of scholarly output and influence but may not fully capture the nuanced qualitative aspects of research, such as the impact on policy, society, or practical applications. Consider addressing this in the limitation section. • Bibliometric analyses may face challenges in capturing emerging research topics or fields. New areas of study might not have accumulated a significant volume of publications or citations, making it difficult to identify trends using conventional methods. Does your study or protocol improve this? If so, how? |
|-------------------------|--|

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Dr. Esperanza Diaz, University of Bergen

Comments to the Author:

Thank you very much for letting me review this protocol: EXPERT CONSENSUS ON A PROTOCOL FOR CONDUCTING BIBLIOMETRIC ANALYSIS OF SCIENTIFIC ARTICLES ON GLOBAL MIGRATION HEALTH (GMH)

The paper is well written and clear, and protocols like this can help advance research in the field. I have however some comments that I would like the authors to address.

1. It is not completely clear if this protocol is meant to be a tool for the region or meant to be globally applicable. And will a follow up be considered in the future? (see point 5 too)

Response: This protocol aims to map scientific articles on international migration (including mobility) globally and health nexus. The output of this study can serve as a starting point for high-level evidence reviews by country, region, and/or specific themes.

See page 2, Introduction, "Ultimately, the relevant articles from this study will be housed in a searchable online public repository and may serve as a starting point for high-level evidence reviews by country, region, and/or specific themes."

2. Since you have a box to explain the term "migrant", please try to avoid long explanations of who you include repeated along the manuscript. It makes the reading difficult. Better to refer to the box, and eventually reorganise the terms there in a hierarchical way?

Response: As recommended, the definition of terms was revised to reflect the hierarchical order of international migration/ mobility and international migrant population.

See pages 5-6, Definition of Terms.

3. In comparison with the elaboration of "migrant", the term "health" is barely defined, and it is not clear to what extent terms like mental health or occupational health will be covered. Please elaborate a little more.

Response: The authors added in the methodology section (page 6) the health areas covered in the search query. This states, "The search terms on health will be selected based on a careful review of previous bibliometric and systematic reviews. Search queries on health include generic terms relating to health, disorder, injury, clinical examination, diagnosis, treatment, therapy, health risks, epidemiology, disease categories (i.e., communicable diseases, non-communicable diseases), and other areas in health (e.g., maternal and reproductive health, nutrition, and mental health)."

Further, the included studies will be classified based on health-related conditions and/or disease classifications, such as psychosocial, mental health and well-being, and work-related injury or disability.

4. In the lists of terms, I would like to see "use of interpreters/language" and "Primary health care", since these are two key themes related to the health of migrants.

Response: Conceptually, the use of interpreters/ language translation in the delivery of healthcare services (including primary care), may be covered under the theme "healthcare access." The feasibility of classifying articles according to specific topics will be considered. However, please note that the classification of articles will largely depend on the performance of the AI and semi-automation tools and the prevalence of the topics in the pool of articles.

5. Following the recently research agenda published by WHO (October 2023), I think themes as multidisciplinary and co-production should be part of the systematic IA-driven search, in order to be able to see if these key issues are incorporated in research.

Response: This is well-noted. We will ensure to consider the relevant themes from the 2023 WHO Global Research Agenda on Health, Migration and Displacement in the analysis and in writing the results and discussion.

6. Actually, I suggest the authors discuss to which degree the protocol will facilitate the evaluation of the evolution of this WHO recommendations in the future.

Response: Please note that WHO is aware of this ongoing study, and they have expressed interest in collaborating with the team. The study findings will be shared with WHO and details of a potential collaboration will be defined by then. Further, the planned public repository will provide a platform for understanding/visualizing the state of the art in global migration health research.

Reviewer: 2

Dr. Ephrem Sedeta, Addis Ababa University College of Health Sciences

Comments to the Author:

Comments to the Author

Pernitez-Agan and colleagues have utilized a systematic search strategy using Scopus to map scientific articles on global migration health. This can be important for identifying trends and patterns in research output over time, mapping the research landscape, identifying research gaps, and informing policy and practice in global migration health.

My comments are below:

- Justify the choice of database: A specific database is often driven by the researcher's goals and the nature of the research question. However, this choice inherently introduces a level of subjectivity and can influence the analysis outcomes. The manuscript should provide a rationale for selecting a specific electronic database for the literature search. Please explain why a certain database was chosen and whether any potential sources of bias were considered.

Response: The reason for choosing Elsevier's Scopus was based on the advantages pointed out in a previous GMH study covering the period, 2000-2016. Among these include the extensive journal coverage of Scopus, including 100% Medline articles coverage, and its built-in analysis. Further, as the current work updates and extends the earlier paper, we are keeping the same database for comparability.

As a developing field, evidence on the biases introduced in bibliometrics is limited (cite: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048733323001130>). Nevertheless, any potential bias arising from the choice of the citation database (e.g., language, geography, theme) will be duly taken into account in examining research productivity. (See reference: <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/frma.2020.593494/full>)

- Articles about brain drain and migrant nurses, physicians, or health professions were excluded. Is there any specific reason why this was excluded from this study and the previous study by Sweileh et al.?

Response: The previous study did not indicate the reason for excluding articles pertaining to brain drain and migrant nurses or physicians or health professions. In the protocol for the current study, the authors did not include search terms for health professions to avoid capturing many irrelevant articles (i.e., pertaining to education and economic aspects). Further, the TITLE-ABSTRACT screening will exclude articles involving health professions but have no health focus (i.e., as described in the search terms on health).

We recognize that the migration of health professionals (i.e., brain drain or gain) is an important health system question. However, this study aims to capture relevant articles by international migrant typology (including health professionals/ international labor migrants as sub-categories) and not by specific issues that concern the international migrant populations (i.e., migration of health professionals).

- Quality vs. Quantity: Bibliometric analyses typically focus on quantitative measures of scholarly output and influence but may not fully capture the nuanced qualitative aspects of research, such as the impact on policy, society, or practical applications. Consider addressing this in the limitation section.

Response: Added in the limitation section.

- Bibliometric analyses may face challenges in capturing emerging research topics or fields. New areas of study might not have accumulated a significant volume of publications or citations, making it difficult to identify trends using conventional methods. Does your study or protocol improve this? If so, how?

Response: We appreciate your feedback. Indeed, approaches to identifying emerging research topics are available. We may be able to show possible topic trends by generating a mapping of frequently co-occurring keywords by year.

Reviewer: 1

Competing interests of Reviewer: No competing interests

Reviewer: 2

Competing interests of Reviewer: No