sustainability-2572029_V2

Type: Review

Title: Food Systems, One Health and Resilience-Led by the FOR-Runners

Authors: Dorit Nitzan *, Bindu Nishal Andreuzza , Deepanwita Chattopadhyay

Comments

2nd version

General comment:

The review is better, integrating more diverse references, but the authors have not really understood or read the papers that I mentioned and that they integrated in their list. Thus, some paragraphs should be rewrite in the light of the new references. This paper looks like more a policy paper than a scientific review.

L159-176 where concepts of holobiont, microbiome and dysbiosis are cited. The holobiont (Holos+Bios) is the association: the Greek words holos, or ''all'' and bios, ''life'', the term holobiont corresponds to a natural living entity made up of a superior organism (i.e. multicellular) called the host, an animal or a plant, and its microbiota.

See at least Wikipedia to understand what are these concepts: Holobionts include the host, virome, microbiome, and any other organisms which contribute in some way to the functioning of the whole (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Holobiont)

Thus, your sentence is not clear (162-163): "… *microbiota residents of animals (e.g., the holobiont), and the collection of microorganisms in a specific niche, including the human gut (e.g., microbiome) may influence the One Health status of each of its pillars and harm their balance [33,34]."*

L188-192: You cannot add the reference that I proposed (37) without any explanation. In this way, the text is not coherent. Your paper is announced as a review, therefore you should cover different aspects of the topics, and discuss them. It is not enough to write "191 - *It is important to unpack the meaning of …"*

On food systems, "The analysis reveals that multiple meanings of "equitable food systems" exist, hinging on varied ideas about inequity, change, and the essence of human wellbeing. Materializing into practical strategies to progress food systems change, the multiplicity of meanings implies inevitable trade-offs when one is prioritized over the other" (ref 37)

From this example on food systems that you wish integrate in the Health considerations, you should also consider the same trade-offs for Health and Resilience. In the case of disease such as COVID 19, you might observe that different approaches have existed in countries, and the results are not correlated with the technologies availabilities.

I already proposed you to discuss this aspect from the paper of In Morand S, Lajaunie C (2019) where they wrote "A well-established "Global Health ethics" is more essential than to build a "One Bioethics", as proposed by the "One Health" approach, or a "Planetary health ethics". As Verweij and

Bovenkerk (2016) pointed out, such “One Bioethics” or “Planetary health ethics” are more the domain of meta-ethics that correspond to a moral belief in “health” and “Planetary health”. The crucial point is the scientific posture adopted in the face of health crises originating from ecological crises, and its implications for studying nature (broadly conceptualised as ranging from a simple mechanism that can be easily fixed to a complex adaptive system that requires care).” In Morand S, Lajaunie C. Linking Biodiversity with Health and Well-being: Consequences of Scientific Pluralism for Ethics, Values and Responsibilities. Asian Bioeth Rev. 2019 Mar 12;11(2):153-168. doi: 10.1007/s41649-019-00076-4. PMID: 33717309; PMCID: PMC7747447 (S. Morand is member of OHHLEP)

386: You should mention that the solutions should be diverse, respecting cultures and health concepts.

Discussion

392-396 – **Not enough, this paragraph is untitled “discussion”, don’t forget controversies that need** to be integrated in order to respect democracy. For the food systems, “Finding the best strategies for food systems change is a subject of intense debate, making it an inherently political affair” (37), how can we imagine that no debate will not accompany changes for both health, food system: it will be much more complex. You should mention this aspect in your discussion. The notion of equity is political and can be seen very differently from one group to another.

You should ask the question: are “global agreements” really possible?

More discussion is needed. If not, this paper is not a scientific/review paper by a policy paper of the organization that you are represented. This sentence “*387*: *By implementing the One Health approach globally, **we want** to transition*” is not a sentence of a scientific paper but a policy paper!

Perhaps can you have a look this paper and all their reviews: Marcel Verweij , Angus Dawson, Public Health Ethics in a Pandemic, *Public Health Ethics*, Volume 13, Issue 2, July 2020, Pages 125–126, https://doi.org/10.1093/phe/phaa032

Many opinions exist. You should mention them in a DISCUSSION. “This includes the diversity of framings within One Health, wherein different partners come to the collaboration with different expectations and agenda. The reference to politics also includes a reference to the different levels of influence enjoyed by the partners to effect change as well as the power dynamics operating among themselves.” In Syed Shahid Abbas and others, Meanings and mechanisms of One Health partnerships: insights from a critical review of literature on cross-government collaborations, Health Policy and Planning, Volume 37, Issue 3, March 2022, Pages 385–399, https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czab134

Conclusions

403: avoid the word “must”. They approach “aims” …

414: “*regulatory frameworks and tools to strengthen the One Health universal health coverage concept.”?*

You are submitting a scientific paper. Is it possible to take into account the diversities of approaches of the democracy? I remind you the paper about new wishes of direct democracy. You can read in Pimbert (2022) paper that I proposed you previously: “Citizens and social movements committed to

transformative agroecology and food sovereignty generally seek to reverse the democratic deficit and exclusion that favour the interests of powerful corporations, financial investors, big farmers and technocratic research institutes. This usually requires an expansion of “direct” democracy in decision-making in order to complement, or replace, models of representative democracy in policymaking and governance.” Michel Pimbert (2022) In Transforming food and agriculture: Competing visions and major controversies. Mondes en développement 2022/3 (n° 199-200), 361-384, Éditions De Boeck Supérieur ISSN 0302-3052, ISBN 9782807398207, DOI 10.3917/med.199.)