



PEER REVIEW

Damani, A. (2020). COVID-19 & Climate Change. Sushruta Journal of Health Policy & Opinion, 13(2). <https://doi.org/10.38192/13.2.10>

JoJo Li

Queen Mary's University of London, UK

j.y.li@smd16.qmul.ac.uk

completed 10 June 2020

Cite as: Li, J.J. (2020) Peer review of 'Damani, A. (2020). COVID-19 & Climate Change.' Sushruta J Health Policy & Opin, 13(2). DOI: [10.38192/13.2.10](https://doi.org/10.38192/13.2.10).p1

Recommendations

Accept with Minor changes

Recommendations to the Authors

Very well identified area that has not been explored. It is a very interesting and relevant topic to discuss at current. The last 2 sentences in discussion 2 on effect of lockdown on data collection of air pollution was very well presented. However, if you could explore these points a bit more, I believe it will make the discussion more interesting.

The following points are areas you could improve in.

1. Your title states COVID-19 and Climate Change, however, in your abstract, your first sentence only focuses on climate change. Moreover, the relationship between covid-19 and climate change was not made clear in the abstract. I think you should read what you have written out loud as the grammar in some places are not quite correct.
2. Perhaps it is format after uploading the article, however, the citation is in between the abstract and the start of the main discussion body. I believe this interrupted the flow of the article. I think you should put the citation above all these.
3. In your first discussion, you mentioned seasonal smog. Perhaps you could be clearer on what aspect of the seasonal smog caused the 600 deaths. You also mentioned wood burning to heat home. I believe most UK citizen will be using gas, electricity or coal to heat homes? Therefore, I don't think it would be major contribution to climate change. Unless you meant burning wood to generate electricity? This statement needs to be made clearer. The next point you talk about the Air Quality Index Scale. I thought this was a bit random as you made no connection between this scale and the UK's score? It seemed a bit out of the blue. It would be better if you could explore this point more and describe how the scale works in more details and include the UK's score, and what we can do to improve it perhaps. The next paragraph you mentioned Davide Tagliapietra who is an environmental researcher. However, in your references, you cited the guardian newspaper. I believe you could've used better references such as actual research papers from PUBMED or textbooks etc. Using a newspaper claim is not always reliable, thus, it would have been better if you used a more reliable source.
4. In your second discussion, you mentioned the London Air Quality Network. However, I was very confused to understand the point you were trying to make. As you did not explain what this



network is, I believed it was talking about using a system to monitor air pollution levels in London. What similar trend is related between this system and the professional organisation? Also, your last sentence does not make sense either. How is the workforce reduced? How is the supply reduced? Are these reduced due to COVID-19 (which you did not mention at all in the first paragraph)? Increased demand – what demand is increased and how is the demand increased? Demand for electricity as people are staying at home or do you mean demand for the NHS? I believe these are points you could explore more. I really liked the ending to this section; therefore, the discussion would be more interesting if you explored these points in more details.

5. Your third discussion point of “effect of SARS-CoV-2”, confused me as it is not consistent with your previous wording of “COVID-19”. If you are discussing the same “COVID-19” then keep it consistent throughout the discussion. Moreover, in your body of the third discussion point, you interchange between “Covid-19” and “COVID-19”. I believe you should stick with one and keep it consistent throughout the discussion. You also mentioned “areas such as London”. Is this an example from the previous sentence? As, in this particular sentence, you did not mention how the transmission of the virus is more likely. Overcrowding? Higher rates of homelessness? You need to be a bit more specific here.

6. The conclusion came about quite suddenly I felt. You never mentioned about the biopsychosocial model in the body of the discussion, so it felt out of place as you explored a new area of discussion, but in the conclusion. Moreover, I believe the use of arrows to explain your points on the biopsychosocial model was a bit inappropriate. Arrows make it seem less professional. I think the biopsychosocial model should have been the 4th discussion point, then the conclusion come after that. However, I don't think you really came to a conclusion at the end as you asked many questions with uncertainties. I think as this is a discussion paper, you should've include your conclusion from the 4 discussion body above and then discuss the uncertainties such as "...". You could've explored how these may affect the future, instead of wording all these uncertainties as questions and end with only time can tell. I also think you could come up with a better ending sentence.