

Review of: "International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs) in Humanitarian Field: why and how to engage with Planetary Health?"

Paolo Lauriola

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

My Comments

In General

The article is interesting and beneficial for INGOs in view of a more consistent approach to complexity.

I would like to underline that Planetary health is not only an integration of disciplines but: “the achievement of the highest attainable standard of health, wellbeing, and equity worldwide through judicious attention to the human systems—political, economic, and social—that shape the future of humanity and the Earth’s natural systems that define the safe environmental limits within which humanity can flourish. Put simply, planetary health is the health of human civilisation and the state of the natural systems on which it depends” *Whitmee S, 2015*

The article should be rearranged more systematically, separating comments and proposals from definitions or any other objective issues.

Decarboxylation is essential, but it is not the only action. There are other actions which must be implemented: intensive farming, pesticides.....

Last but not least, I suggest that “less is more.”

In particular

Page 1: at the top of the page, the affiliations of both authors are not complete

Page 1 (abstract): “Many challenges faced by humanitarian actors are exacerbated by the climate crisis that could be considered itself another humanitarian crisis” Such a sentence is misleading. I think a universal definition of Humanitarian Crisis does not exist (<https://www.concern.org.uk/news/what-is-a-humanitarian-crisis>). In addition, Climate Change can cause directly and indirectly an incredible amount of humanitarian crisis. Please remember that Climate Change is also (preferably) named Climate Crisis (<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2019/may/17/why-the-guardian-is-changing-the-language-it-uses-about-the-environment>), as you mentioned in the article. By the way, explaining such a difference in meanings can be helpful. Anyway, please use the same word across the article.

Page 1 (abstract): The term “decarbonise actions” is unclear. Please be careful; see above.

Page 2: I'm afraid I have to disagree with the sentence, "There is no consensual definition of Planetary Health". The article you mentioned clearly describes the differences among other two holistic approaches, which doesn't mean that "Planetary health" is defined differently. Please note that other similar approaches exist (Buse CG, Oestreicher JS, Ellis NR et al. Public health guide to field developments linking ecosystems, environments and health in the Anthropocene. J Epidemiol Community Health. 2018 May;72(5):420-425. doi: 10.1136/jech-2017-210082. Epub 2018 Jan 12)

Page 2: My suggestion is to avoid discussing such a divisive issue. For instance, the sentence "definitions of similar approaches are polysemic and nuanced and undermine a clear understanding.6" doesn't add much. The articles you mentioned and the one I suggested are enough.

Page 2: The para "Climate crisis is a humanitarian crisis" would be essential. I suggest rearranging it more systematically instead of raising some anecdotic manner.

Page 5: "....have been increased infectivity and COVID-19 mortality rate in England³⁰", not only in England. For this and the rest of the section, please look at: Di Ciaula A, Moshhammer H, Lauriola P, Portincasa P, Environmental health, COVID-19, and the syndemic: internal medicine facing the challenge Internal and Emergency Medicine, October 2022, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11739-022-03107-5>).