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Reviewer's report:

Health adaptation policy for climate vulnerable groups

It is refreshing to read a manuscript where the authors are relatively explicit about their biases, although it does raise some questions about objectivity.

The manuscript suffers from several major flaws:

• It is very difficult to interpret the results of the critical computational linguistics without being able to compare with analyses for somewhat similar health policies designed to protect vulnerable groups, such as clean air regulations. The authors work on the assumption that only policies with explicit references to a vulnerable group are able to protect such groups. However, this assumption is unsupported and is inconsistent with how other (and successful) policy documents were structured.

• The critical discourse analysis has limited applicability and should be removed.

• The stated goal of the manuscript was to investigate the “adequacy” of policies to protect vulnerable groups, not how policy should be formulated, so those paragraphs in the Discussion and Table 2 should be removed.

• The analyses would be much more useful if they used a definition of vulnerability that is consistent with the rest of the literature. It ignores that in some regions certain disadvantaged groups could benefit from climate change, and that new groups will likely become affected by climate change. The IPCC definition from the 5th Assessment Report would allow comparison with the larger body of research in this area.

Other comments:

• The authors should be more prudent in statements implying there is wide agreement on a concept or conclusion where the only reference is a paper by the authors.

• The social determinants of health are not the only primary health determinants.

• There are multiple analyses of national adaptation policies and the extent to which they consider vulnerable groups.
• There are 196 Parties to the UNFCCC.

• The IPCC 3rd Assessment Report was not the primary impetus for including adaptation as one of the pillars of the negotiations under the UNFCCC, although the assessment was helpful to the discussions.

• The authors should check their history of the inclusion of adaptation in the Convention. The Nairobi Work Plan was and continues to be a major component.

• The statement at the end of the first paragraph on page 7 should be deleted as it is wrong. All Parties to the Convention are required to produce regular national communications that include a section on adaptation.

• The statement on the NAPAs is not quite right either, and needs a citation.

• Please update the number of national communications submitted.

• Please provide more balance in the discussion of health adaptation in national communications by comparing this with the discussions for other sectors, such as agriculture.

• Page 8, the World Health Assembly determines the priorities and work plan for WHO, not the UNFCCC.

• The authors need to justify only reviewing national adaptation policies in English.

• Figure 1 could easily be removed.