

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Determining the public health impact of climate change: a national study using a Health Impact Assessment approach in Wales

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Laurent CHAMBAUD

Submitted on: 26 Mar 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2024.1606972

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

This study is dedicated to report the use of Health Impact Assessment method (HIA) in exploring the impact of climate change on health, at a "regional" level (Wales).

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Strengths :

Very innovative approach applied to climate change and health (HIA),

Design of this intervention well documented

Results well depicted in the different tables

Limits:

No presentation of the area (Wales) in terms of population, inequalities... There is some data on age distribution but appears in the discussion.

Even if the authors pledge for generalization (line 287–288) there is no evidence to support this in the paper

Q 3 Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

No major comments.

Other comments:

- in the introduction, it would be appreciated to give some basic data on Wales.

- line 83–84 "there is limited evidence demonstrating the wider public health and well-being impacts on specific

population groups". I don't agree. There are some literature on this impact, even in specific groups. For instance the latest edition of the Lancet Countdown <https://www.thelancet.com/countdown-health-climate> or data in The European observatory on climate change and health.

-In Methods, the qualitative method is well described, but the quantitative method is less obvious.

line 119: is there any effect of postponing this intervention because of Covid? (in chapter method in particular)

-pp149–150: only one third of stakeholders finally participated in the process. No discussion on this percentage.

-in discussion (from 232) It would be important to discuss how this method could be replicated in other contexts.

Finally, it would be interesting (in chapter discussion) to have some information on how the different stakeholders, policy makers have seized the subject and the results

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes. No comment

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes. No comment

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

As I am not english language native, I am not the best person to comment. But I would say yes!

Q 7 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

Q 8 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?)

Yes. 2 minor comments:

- References 3 and 45 seem very similar. And there is an erro in ref 3 (15 instead of 1.5)
- there are quite a lot of references coming from Welsh governement or institutions (7). This is related with the paper, as anchored to Welsh's context. But it is difficult to expand to other contexts as there is no reference to another context.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9 Originality



Q 10 Rigor



Q 11 Significance to the field



Q 12 Interest to a general audience



Q 13 Quality of the writing



Q 14 Overall scientific quality of the study



REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Minor revisions.