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Reviewer's report:

The paper details a research protocol to undertake a systematic review of the effectiveness of workplace interventions to address the health and wellbeing of employees in male-dominated industries.

The protocol addresses an important issues and contains merit as a concept.

The paper needs to be more tightly written. It currently contains some typos, and in general the writing style needs strengthening (a mentor might be useful in this regard). Please (re)write in the past tense when referring to published work.

The argument presented for undertaking the review needs to be sharpened. While the Background describes negative consequences associated with working in an MDI, it does not make a persuasive case for the need for a better understanding of what interventions are effective. Moreover, some key work that has undertaken a systematic review of mental health interventions in male-dominated industries is not cited. Pls refer to Lee, Roche, Duraisingam et al. 2014. Effective interventions for mental health in male-dominated workplaces. Mental Health Review, 19; 237-250. This is not the Lee et al 2014 currently cited.

Methods

Greater clarity and precision is required in terms of objectives, terminology and outcomes to be measured.

1. The research question needs to be clearly stated in greater detail.
2. Objectives: The flow of the objectives could be clearer - this would aid the authors in synthesising and subsequently analysing the data. At present they seem disjointed, with the primary aim - the effectiveness of workplace interventions - lost in the mix.
3. Inclusion criteria: A clearer definition of 'health and wellbeing' is required, along with a clear definition of what the authors mean by 'health behaviour'. Whilst the authors recognise that the term 'health and wellbeing' is opaque, for the purposes of this review a precise definition is required to address inclusion and exclusion criteria.
4. Types of outcome measures to be included are a little unclear. This lack of clarity may relate to how the objectives have been articulated in the first instance.
5. Search strategy - What is outlined is appropriate, but a rationale also needs to be provided for not including the grey literature.
6. Analysis - as a narrative analysis is likely, further detail is required of how this will be undertaken. Clarity in objectives would help with this.

Overall

This systematic review holds potential importance to our understanding of what interventions work,
and do not work, in MDI. However, the protocol as it currently stands requires further refinement.
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