

Peer Review

Review of: "Strengthening COP Meetings through Cross-Sectoral Thematic Convergence and Highlighting Health in COPs"

Luca Nguyen Dinh¹

1. University of Malta, Malta

Interesting piece, thank you. Here are my suggestions:

1. Anchor the commentary on one explicit take-home message. Open with the main message of the commentary (e.g., "COPs must tackle issues XX and YY in a cross-cutting and comprehensive approach.") and use subsequent sections to supply evidence or policy levers that support the claim of the commentary. This should help the commentary to scope down instead of being an extended report.
2. (Minor point) Verify data regarding: "The Health Day of the COP28 resulted in several key outcomes, including the endorsement Declaration on Climate and Health by 120 countries." I see there is the official reference in the commentary; however, from other websites, I found different numbers, for instance, 125 here <https://climahealth.info/cop28-hub/#:~:text=Key%20Outcomes,health%20in%20the%20climate%20agenda> and 123 here <https://climate-adapt.eea.europa.eu/en/observatory/news-archive-observatory/more-than-120-countries-endorse-cop28-health-and-climate-declaration>. Perhaps it is better to write that more than 120 countries endorsed it instead of providing a hard number;
3. Commentaries are usually 1,000 - 1,500 words; the piece is 2,852 words, excluding the abstract and reference list. So a focused reduction is advisable.

This is a solid piece of work, but it must tighten its thesis and trim its length to get to the point.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.